

THE

CAPTIVI OF PLAUTUS

[redacted]

Plautus, Titus Maccius

THE

CAPTIVI OF PLAUTUS

EDITED WITH INTRODUCTION, APPARATUS CRITICUS AND COMMENTARY

BY

W. M. LINDSAY, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS,
LATELY FELLOW OF JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD.

METHUEN & CO.
36 ESSEX STREET W.C.
LONDON

1900

[redacted]

PREFACE.

Since the *Captivi* is the one play of Plautus in whose text are represented all[1] the pre-Renaissance MSS., I have thought it worth while to re-collate the MSS.[2] for this edition and provide a full *apparatus criticus.* The gleaning of the field already reaped by the authors of the larger Teubner edition has not been mis-spent labour. It has contributed not merely to the improvement of the text, especially in the matter of orthography[3], but to a clearer knowledge of the relationship between the MSS. of the first eight plays.

The introductory pages deal mainly with Prosody and Metre, the two subjects on which information seems most required by English students of Plautus. I hope in time to edit other plays of this author and to take up one by one the remaining topics of interest, such as Plautine Accidence and Syntax, and the history of the Plautine Text in antiquity.

To Professor Skutsch of Breslau University my best thanks are due for the help I have received from him in the preparation of this volume.

W. M. LINDSAY.

[1] With the exception of *C*, which contains only the last twelve plays.

[2] For the Ambrosian Palimpsest the Apograph of Studemund is and must always be the final court of appeal.

[3] The orthography which an editor of Plautus seeks to reproduce is that of the ancient recension from which all our MSS. are ultimately derived. This recension would, in all likelihood, exhibit earlier and later forms side by side, e.g. *aequissumus* and *aequissimus*, *aequos*, *aequs*, *aecus* and even *aequus*. The MSS. are far from being infallible guides in this matter; but their consistency in such spellings as *optumus* (cf. *occupo*), *minimus* (cf. *incipio*), shews that adherence to their best tradition is safer policy than an arbitrary selection of, let us say, *-umus* as the only permissible form of the Superlative ending.

[redacted]

CORRIGENDA ET ADDENDA.

p. 130 (App. Crit.) ad v. 44	*del.* (sae- *V*?)
p. 132 (App. Crit.) ad v. 47	*corr.* cōp. *DVE*
	corr. confixerunt *VEJ*
p. 134 (App. Crit.) ad v. 56	*corr.* inmemorabiles *VE*: imm- *BDJ*
p. 146 (App. Crit.) ad v. 96	*corr.* Seras qui *VE ante corr. J*
p. 156 (App. Crit.) ad v. 140	*corr.* adulescente *ex* adolescente *E*
p. 168 (App. Crit.) ad v. 186	*corr.* *Parasiti pers. om. VEJ*
p. 172 (App. Crit.) ad II i	*corr.* *J* (Lor-)
p. 188 (App. Crit.) ad v. 266	*corr.* attinet *VEJ*
p. 216 (Notes)	*add.* 384. **In patriam ad patrem.** Cf. v. 126 *ad fratrem ad alios captivos*. For a list of examples of this construction see Mueller in *Rhein. Mus.* LIV. 385
p. 231 (Notes) ad v. 458 (fin.)	*add.* Fleckeisen inserts *ad* before *captivos* (cf. v. 126)
p. 288 (App. Crit.) ad v. 751	*corr.* Heg. *om.* V^1 (*add.* V^2) *E*

EXPLANATION OF SYMBOLS.

A = Codex Ambrosianus, Milan, saec. iii—iv

T = Codex Turnebi, lost, saec. ix—x (?)

B = Codex Vetus, Rome, saec. x fin.

D = Codex Ursinianus, Rome, saec. xi

E = Milan MS., saec. xii

V = Leyden MS., saec. xii

J = London MS., saec. xii

O = Fragmentum Ottobonianum, Rome, saec. xi

ς = recensio Itala.

P = the archetype of *BDEVJO*, lost, saec. ix—x (?)

P^A = the archetype of *TP*, lost, saec. iv—v (?)

n.l. = non legitur. Thus *J n.l.* implies that the reading of *J* cannot be ascertained, whether through an erasure, a hole in the page or some other cause.

Osbernus, a monk of Gloucester, who in the twelfth century compiled the *Panormia* (printed in Mai *Classici Auctores*, vol. VIII), in which numerous quotations from Plautus occur. They are taken from a 'doctored' text, akin to JOV^2, and are therefore of little value as evidence of the true reading of a passage.

< >. Angular brackets enclose words and letters not found in the MSS., but apparently omitted in error.

[ ]. Square brackets enclose words and letters found in the MSS., but apparently inserted in error.

[redacted]

INTRODUCTION.

I. THE MANUSCRIPTS OF PLAUTUS.

1. Our MSS. of Plautus belong to two families. Of one family the only representative is

(A) the Ambrosian Palimpsest, a MS. probably of the Irish Monastery of Bobbio in N. Italy, now in the Ambrosian Library, Milan (with shelf-mark *G* 82 *supr.*). It is written in Capital letters of the fourth, possibly the third century; but its original writing was effaced from its pages, and a new text, a portion of the Old Testament (1 Kings—2 Chron.), was written upon them in the 7th or 8th century. Though it contained originally all the twenty-one 'Varronian' plays of Plautus, the plays declared by Varro to be universally accepted as genuine, many leaves have been lost, including the whole of the *Amphitruo*, *Asinaria*, *Aulularia* and *Curculio*, and nearly the whole of the *Captivi* and *Vidularia*. Of the leaves that remain many are wholly or in great part undecipherable, and all have offered more or less difficulty to collators. The best preserved plays are the *Stichus*, *Persa*, *Poenulus*, *Pseudolus* and *Trinummus*. A full description of the MS. and an apograph of its text will be found in Studemund, *Codicis Rescripti Ambrosiani Apographum*, Berlin, 1889.

2. The other family, usually called the 'Palatine' family, includes a number of MSS. in minuscule script, all derived from a lost archetype which we may designate P^A:—

(T) the Codex Turnēbi or Fragmenta Senonensia, a fragmentary MS. (of the 9th or 10th century probably), which belonged to the Benedictine Monastery of S. Colombe at Sens in Central France, and was used by the French scholar Adrien Turnèbe in the sixteenth century. The MS. seems to have been destroyed shortly after Turnèbe's use of it. Besides the few isolated readings which he

quotes in his *Adversaria* from various plays (*Asin.*, *Capt.*, *Cas.*, *Curc.*, *Most.*, *Poen.*, *Pseud.*, *Rud.*, *Stich.*), a full collation of its text in the *Persa* and *Poenulus*, in the first half of the *Rudens* (to about v. 790), the second half of the *Pseudolus* (from about v. 730), and in parts of the *Bacchides* (circ. vv. 35—80, 570—650, 810—900), has been preserved in the margins of a sixteenth century edition of Plautus in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. An account of the Codex Turnebi and a photographic facsimile of this collation are given in my *Codex Turnebi of Plautus*, Oxford, 1898 (cf. *Class. Rev.* xiii. 254).

3. Three other MSS., written in Germany, are descended from a common original (**P**). It must have been a transcript made from $\mathbf{P}^{A}$ at a later time than the **T**-text was transcribed. For in four passages of the *Rudens* (vv. 648 sqq., 666 sqq., 698 sqq., 712 sqq.), where the torn sides of two leaves in $\mathbf{P}^{A}$ left a lacuna at the beginnings and ends of the lines, the scribe of **P** seems to have found less than the scribe of **T** (or of the original from which **T** was copied). V. 700, for example, *Ne indignum id habeas* etc. began with the word *habeas* in **P**, but with *indignum id habeas* in **T**. One may conjecture, but it is no more than a conjecture, that $\mathbf{P}^{A}$ had been transmitted from France to Germany for the purpose of being copied for a German monastery library and had suffered in the transmission. The number of lines to a page in $\mathbf{P}^{A}$ may be inferred from the lacunae in the *Rudens* and other plays to have been from 19 to 21 (see § 13). Nineteen is the uniform number of lines to a page in the Ambrosian Palimpsest; and that $\mathbf{P}^{A}$ was in Capital script like the Ambrosian Palimpsest is suggested (hardly proved) by the fact that in **P** the letter *h*, which has in the Capital script of the Ambrosian Palimpsest and other Latin MSS. a *K*-form, was often confused with the letter *k*. Some of its spellings, *kaec* for *haec*, *kuic* for *huic*, &c. (*Bacch.* 105, 108, 110, 169 &c.), have been faithfully reproduced in the Codex Vetus (**B**) (see below). The number of lines to a page in **P** itself was apparently 33 (see below).

4. In dealing with the descendants of **P** it will be convenient to discuss separately MSS. of the first eight plays (*Amph.—Epid.*, with the exclusion of the *Bacchides*) and MSS. of the last twelve[1] (*Bacch.—Truc.*). For at some time or other the text[2] had been

[1] The last part of P^{A} containing the *Vidularia* had been lost. P ended with the words (reproduced in B) PLAVTI TRVCVLENTVS EXPLICIT INCIPIT VIDVLARIA.

[2] Possibly in P (Lindsay, *Palatine Text of Plautus*, Parker, Oxford, 1896).

divided into two volumes, the second of which contained the last twelve plays. This second volume, presumably owing to a defective title-page, fell into such neglect that at the Renaissance only the first eight plays were known, and the discovery of a MS. which contained the last twelve was hailed as the discovery of a lost classic.

5. The last twelve plays are found in three MSS.:—

(B) the Codex Vetus (containing also the first eight plays; see below). This is a MS. which belonged originally to some German monastery and in later times to the Library of the Elector Palatine. It is now in the Vatican Library (with shelf-mark *Pal. lat.* 1615). Its minuscule script of the German type is generally referred to the end of the tenth century. The last seven plays (*Pseud.*, *Poen.*, *Pers.*, *Rud.*, *Stich.*, *Trin.*, *Truc.*) were divided between several scribes, to each of whom was assigned only a small portion to copy, with the happy result that in these plays we have an extremely faithful reproduction of the original, even without a corrector's aid. Corrections are frequent in the earlier plays (*Bacch.*, *Most.*, *Men.*, to the middle of the *Miles*) and retrieve the numerous errors of the scribes. But for the latter half of the *Miles* and nearly the whole of the *Mercator* (to v. 1012) B cannot be regarded as so faithful a copy of its original. That original we must assume to have been P itself, unless we can believe that these already-mentioned miswritings of so common words as *haec*, *huic* could have remained uncorrected through more stages of transcription.

Assuming P to have been the immediate original of B, we can shew the number of lines to the page of P to have been 33. For the excessive conscientiousness of the German monk who copied in B a part of the *Poenulus* led him to copy the very headings of the page of his original at the place where they stood in the original! So that in the margin at vv. 1222—3 we find *plauti*, at vv. 1255—6 *paenulus*, at vv. 1288—9 *plauti*, and again at vv. 1354—5 *plauti*, at v. 1385 *penulus*,—sure indications that the *Poenulus* in the original of B was written on pages of some 33 lines. The transposition of two long passages of the same play, each of 66 lines (vv. 218—284, which follow v. 352, and vv. 480—546, which follow v. 608), is the result of two broadsheets of the original, the second and the third broadsheet of a quaternion, having changed places. The second broadsheet, that is the second and seventh leaves, contained on leaf ii vv. 218—284, and on leaf vii vv. 547—608. The third, that is the third and sixth leaves, contained on leaf iii vv. 285—352, and on leaf vi vv. 480—546. Each leaf thus held 66 lines, each page 33. That this number of lines to a page persisted through the other plays is of itself the most natural supposition and receives some confirmation from an old quaternion-mark, barely

legible, at the foot of fol. 173^v after *Rud.* 451, viz. xxxiii. For 33 quaternions of pages of some such content as this would be required for this amount of the text.

The other two minuscule MSS., which contain the last twelve plays, are closely related to each other. They are both direct copies of one and the same original (P^{CD}), and that original itself a copy of **P**, but by no means so faithful a copy as **B**. They are:—

6. (**C**) the Codex Decurtatus, now in the Palatine collection at Heidelberg (shelf-mark *Pal. Lat.* 1613), but formerly in the Abbey of Freising near Munich. It is written in minuscules of the eleventh century and contains only the last twelve plays; though the fact that the first quaternion was originally marked xvii, the second xviii, and so on, shews us that it was copied from an original which contained all the plays. **C** has 26 lines to the page.

7. (**D**) the Codex Ursinianus, in the Vatican Library (shelf-mark *Vat. lat.* 3870), written in minuscules of the eleventh century. It was this MS. whose discovery (in some part of Germany) at the Renaissance caused so much enthusiasm among scholars, who now for the first time became acquainted with the last twelve plays of Plautus (Ritschl, *Prolegomena*, xxxii.; *Opusc.* v. 296). All MSS. of Plautus written subsequent to its discovery reproduce its text of these plays in an edited form known as the 'Itala recensio' (Ritschl, *Prolegg.* xlv. sqq.; *Opusc.* ii. 1 sqq.). **D** contains also some of the first eight plays (see below). It has, like **C**, 26 lines to the page; and this number has been assumed for P^{CD} on the strength partly of this coincidence, partly of other indications.

8. Of our manuscript authorities for the first eight plays two have been already mentioned; **B**, containing all the eight, and **D**, containing the first three and *Capt.* 1—503[1]. But the relation of **B** to **D** in the first eight plays and for the last twelve is different. For the last twelve **B** stands at a stage nearer to the archetype than **D**, at the same stage as the lost original (P^{CD}) of **D**. But for the first eight **B** and **D** seem to be as closely related as **C** and **D** for the last twelve, both being immediate copies of one and the

[1] This was apparently the exact half of the first eight plays in the original, and occupies exactly 8⅝ quaternions in **D**.

same original (P^{BD}), an original which probably had, like P^{CD}, 26? lines to a page (§ 7), and which may have been the first part of P^{CD}.

9. The text of D is precisely of the same value as the text of B in the earlier plays (see Gillespie in *Harvard Studies* ix. 109). But throughout the first eight plays B has received certain corrections, which I propose to denote by the symbol B^3. These corrections, unlike the corrections in the first four of the last twelve plays, and unlike those corrections which are properly marked B^2 in the first eight, have been taken, not from the common original (P^{BD}) of B and D, but from another MS. of great value, which contained various lines (e.g. *Aul.* 454) that had been omitted in P^{BD}, and which preserved the genuine reading in numerous cases of corruption in P^{BD}. This MS. was however a descendant of the same archetype as P^{BD}, and may indeed have been the actual original from which P^{BD} was copied[1]. If P^{BD} and P^{CD} were the first and second half of one MS., it is conceivable that the source of the B^3-corrections was the first half of the MS. P.

It is plain that the scribes of B, when beginning the task of copying, had an original which contained only the first eight plays. They began their work on what is now fol. 9, and on the reverse side of that leaf wrote a title: *in hoc volumine continentur comediae plauti numero viii*, with a list of the first eight plays (*Amph.—Epid.*). When the last twelve plays were added and the *Querolus* (a late imitation of Plautus) prefixed by the same staff of scribes, that title and list were erased, and on the first page of the quaternion which was prefixed with the *Querolus* a new title was written: *In hoc volumine continentur comediae plauti numero xxi*, with a full list of the plays beginning with the *Querolus* (hence 'twenty-one,' not 'twenty'), and with a slight break in the list between the *Epidicus* and the *Bacchides*. The nature of B may be explained on the hypothesis that the scribes began with an original (P^{BD}) which contained the first eight plays only; that a new MS. (P), containing all twenty plays (perhaps with the *Querolus* prefixed), and being itself the original from which P^{BD} had been copied, was brought into requisition for the correction of B; that from this new MS. the last twelve plays (with the *Querolus*) were copied, and the old title with the list of eight plays was replaced by a new title with a full list. For the second part of the MS. no fresh original of equal importance was available, and the various correctors of this part used the actual original from which the copy was made[2].

[1] Here are some indications of its relationship to P^{BD}. It seems to have had in Asin. 266 *obsca*^{er}*euauit*, which was also the reading of P^{BD} (cf. obscaeuauit *B*, obsceuauit *D*, obscaeruauit P^{E}; see below); Aul. 587 $\overset{audiui}{edi}$, in P^{BD} $\overset{audiui}{di}$ (cf. di audiui BP^{E}, di *D*); Cas. 634 *necadamabo*, in P^{BD} *necadamabo*. And it shared a large number of corrupt readings with P^{BD}, e.g. Cas. 347 (cf. *Journ. Phil.* xxvi. 289).

[2] Ritschl found also indications that they occasionally used the original (P^{CD}) of C and D (see the Preface to his edition of the *Miles Gloriosus*).

10. Two other MSS. come from an original (P^E), which was itself a copy of P^{BD}, so that their evidence is of little or no value against the united testimony of **B** and **D**. They are:—

(**E**) in the Ambrosian Library, Milan (*J* 257 *inf.*), saec. xii. ult. Part of the *Aulularia* (vv. 192—605) has been added by a 15th cent. corrector[1] from the 'Itala recensio.'

(**V**) in the University Library, Leyden (*Voss. lat.* 4°. 30), saec. xii. in. It has lost *Amph.*, *Asin.*, *Aul.* 1—189, *Epid.* 245—*fin.*

11. Certain corrections (V^2) in the Leyden MS. come from an inferior 'doctored' text of P^E (see *Class. Rev.* x. 319) which was the original of the two MSS. that remain to be mentioned:—

(**J**) in the British Museum (*Reg.* 15 *C.* XI.), saec. xii. in., a MS. somewhat damaged by fire.

It contains a 'subscriptio,' which seems to have been copied from the original 'doctored' text:

> Exemplar mendum tandem me compulit ipsum
> Cunctantem nimium Plautum exemplarier istum,
> Ne graspicus (*leg.* graphicus) mendis proprias idiota repertis
> Adderet et liber hic falso patre falsior esset.

(**O**) in the Ottobonian collection at the Vatican (*Ottob. Misc. lat.* 687), saec. xi., a mere fragment containing *Capt.* 400—555.

This 'doctored' text of the first eight plays is practically useless. The 'Itala recensio,' based in the last twelve plays upon **D**, seems in the earlier plays to have been based on a MS. that exhibited this 'doctored' text. All Renaissance MSS. of Plautus are therefore of no value whatsoever as evidence for the text of Plautus, whether in the first eight or in the last twelve plays. Where they diverge from the **P**-text their reading is due either to a corruption in their original or to conjectural emendation by their editor. A collation of one MS. of this kind (*F*, a Leipzig MS.) will be found in the Critical Apparatus of the large Teubner edition of Plautus, a collation of parts of another, the Codex Burneianus at the British Museum (*Burn.* 228) in the Appendix to my *Codex Turnebi of Plautus*.

12. All these extant minuscule MSS. and **T**, a lost minuscule MS., we have found to be descendants of a common archetype P^A,

[1] The corrections by this hand are ignored in my critical notes, as are the corrections by Renaissance hands in the other MSS.

which seems to have been written in Capital script, and therefore to have dated from not later than the 5th century. Our manuscript evidence for the text of Plautus thus resolves itself into two ancient MSS. in Capital script (with K for H), one preserved in part (A), the other lost (P^A).

13. We have indications that P^A shared in many respects the outward form of A. In A there are 19 lines to the page throughout the plays. In P^A the number seems to have varied between 19 (*Epidicus*), 20 (*Casina*, *Rudens*), and 21 (*Mostellaria*). (See Seyffert in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, lxxx. 236, 1895.) In A the Cantica are arranged according to the Alexandrian method of Colometry, like that described in Heliodorus' notes to Aristophanes (ed. Thiemann, Halle, 1869), the longest lines beginning at the extreme left-hand margin of the page (ἐν ἐκθέσει), the shortest nearer the middle of the page (ἐν εἰσθέσει). If we examine the lacunae in our minuscule MSS. that are due to holes in the leaves of P^A and observe what parts of the lines have been absorbed by the same hole on the recto and verso pages of the leaf, we find the same arrangement suggested. In *Cas.* 771, for example, an Iambic Senarius which stood on the verso page,

Sed nimium lepide dissimulant, quasi nihil sciant,

the words *quasi nihil sciant* have been cut off. The corresponding line on the recto page seems to be v. 751, a short line of a Canticum,

Gladium Casinam intus habere ait.

Only the first word, *gladium*, has disappeared; so that this line could not have begun at the extreme left-hand margin, but must have occupied about the same position in the page of P^A as it does in the page of A.

But although the method of indicating the division of 'lines' (properly cola) was probably identical in A and P^A, there are clear instances that these two early MSS. often adopted different divisions of a Canticum into lines, so that in this respect, as in so many others, A and P^A represent two different early editions or 'recensions' of the plays (see iii. § 5).

14. The Scene-headings in A and P^A seem to have been of similar form, the proper names being stated in the first line, the rôles in the second, e.g. *Persa* II. v.:

A TOXILVS B SAGARISTIO Δ SOPKOCLIDISCA · C ·
SERVI · II · ANCILLA

one of the two lines being written in red, the other in black, and Greek letters ('notae personarum') being prefixed to each proper name[1]. The same Greek letters were used throughout the Scene to indicate the speakers. After the first line of the Scene-heading came the mark *C*, if the Scene was a Canticum, or *DV* if the Scene was a Deverbium (Diverbium).

Since **A** is a palimpsest MS., anything that was written in red or other pigment has been washed out, so that all that has been left of the Scene-headings is the proper names, everything else having probably been in red pigment. The 'notae personarum' throughout the Scenes have also disappeared, only blank spaces remaining.

In **P**^{A} most of the Scene-headings seem to have had their complete equipment of names of persons, names of rôles, 'notae personarum,' and the marks *C* or *DV*. But the frequent omission and inaccurate statement of the proper names suggest that in the original from which **P**^{A} was itself derived, the proper names were absent, perhaps never having been filled in by the 'rubricator.' Where they are present in **P**^{A}, they have been supplied with the help of the text. Proper names which do not occur in the text could not be supplied; and so the names of a large number of the characters in the plays, for which the Scene-headings of **A** have not been preserved, remain unknown to us (e.g. of the 'matrona' in the *Menaechmi*). The same process of supplying missing names to the Scene-headings was carried on at various stages in the transmission of the Palatine text.

The Scene-heading nomenclature in our minuscule MSS. has therefore no authority. Their curious STALITIO (-CIO) of *Cas.* II. iii., III. iii., for which we find in **A** (at III. iii.) the right name, LYSIDAMUS, has been absurdly extracted from two corrupt readings of the Palatine text, *tibi stalitio* for *tittibilicio* in v. 347:

non ego istuc uerbum empsim tittibilicio,

and *stalicio* for *sta ilico* in v. 960:

heus, sta ilico, amator.

(For details see Prescott in *Harvard Studies* ix. 102.)

[1] This was the normal form. But we have occasional departures from it, e.g. *Poen.* v. v. (K) ANTAMOENIDES EIDEM (·C·). (Seyffert in Bursian's
MILES
Jahresbericht, xlvii. 9—10. 1886.)

And the same neglect of the 'rubricator' to supply Scene-headings, 'notae personarum,' and the marks *C* and *DV* reappears in various descendants of P^A from time to time, and has led to the almost total disappearance of the 'notae personarum' and these marks from our MSS.[1]

The same type of Scene-headings is found in the Codex Bembinus (5th cent.) of Terence. The Didascaliae of the Bembinus shew the same variety of lines in red and black. Of the Plautine Didascaliae we have only two examples (Studemund in *Commentationes Mommsenianae*), those of the Stichus and Pseudolus in A, where the black lines only remain, the red lines having been washed out. In P^A the Didascaliae seem not to have been present.

15. The Arguments prefixed to the plays of Plautus are of two kinds, Acrostic and non-Acrostic. In P^A the Acrostic Arguments were used, with the addition occasionally (*Amph.*, *Aul.*, *Merc.*, *Mil.*) of the non-Acrostic[2]. In A no Arguments were written by the scribe, but non-Acrostic Arguments have been added in a later (5th century) hand in Uncial script wherever a suitable blank space was available (*Pers.*, *Pseud.*, *Stich.*).

16. The Order of the Plays is different in A and P^A, though the arrangement in alphabetic groups is the same. The M-group in A follows this order: *Merc.*, *Most.*, *Mil.*, *Men.*; in P^A, *Most.*, *Men.*, *Mil.*, *Merc.*; the P-group in A, *Poen.*, *Pers.*, *Pseud.*; in P^A, *Pseud.*, *Poen.*, *Pers.* The position of the *Bacchides* after the *Epidicus* in our minuscule MSS. (due to the reference to the *Epidicus* in *Bacch.* 214) is probably later than P^A, to judge from the gap at the end of *Aul.* and beginning of *Bacch.*

17. Besides these differences of A and P^A with regard to Colometry, Scene-headings, Didascaliae, Arguments, and Order of Plays, there are differences of text. From the remarks of the Grammarians and Lexicographers of the Empire we can see that varieties of text, in other words various editions of Plautus, were prevalent; and some of these varieties we find reproduced in A

[1] Through the greater part of the *Trinummus*, however, the 'notae personarum' are retained in B, viz. A for Megaronides, B for Callicles, Λ (*leg.* Δ?) for Philto, E for Lesbonicus, Z for Lysiteles, K for Stasimus. For the remains of the marks *C* and *DV* which occasionally persist even in the 12th century MSS. see Ritschl, *Opusc.* iii. pp. 1 sqq. and add to his list those of the Codex Turnebi and of the Leyden 12th century MS. (*V*) (see Schoell's edition of the *Casina*).

[2] That these came from the margin into the text is suggested by the fact that in *Amph.*, *Aul.*, they precede, but in *Merc.*, *Mil.*, follow the Acrostic.

and **P**^A^. For example, Charisius, speaking of *Bacch.* 545, says, 'in quibusdam non ferunt.' In **A** the passage, vv. 540—551, is omitted, but it is present in **P**^A^. In the Dictionary of Verrius Flaccus, epitomized by Festus, *Epid.* 620 is quoted under the letter *G* for the word *gravastellus*, under *R* for *ravistellus*. The former is the reading of **P**^A^, the latter of **A**[1]. Differences in the text would arise from the re-casting of plays by stage-managers at the revival of a play. A whole Scene might be substituted for the original one; as, for example, both **A** and **P**^A^ offer two versions of the final Scene of the *Poenulus*, one (vv. 1372—1422) directly following the other (vv. 1338—1371) (cf. *Stich.* 48—57). Or a Scene that seemed too long or too short might have a passage removed or added; as in the last Scene of the *Captivi* vv. 1016—1022 are omitted in **A**, but are present in **P**^A^. Or an archaic phrase or construction might be modernized, e.g. Bacch. 519 *narret logos* (**A**), *dicat iocum* (**P**^A^), Pseud. 432 *fors fuat an istaec* (**A**), *fors sit an ea tibi* (**P**^A^). Occasionally what seems a variant of this last kind is really a corruption, the modern form having been written as a gloss above the archaic form for the convenience of the reader, and having been mistaken by a subsequent copyist for a correction of the text. It is probably in this way that the word *rogo*, the stock explanation of O. Lat. *oro* in the Dictionaries of the Empire, has ousted the Plautine *oro* in Most. 682 *bonum aequomque oras* (**P**^A^) in **A**, and in Pers. 321 *quod mecum dudum orasti* (**A**) in **P**^A^.

18. The existence of rival versions had the natural result that one edition was provided with marginal varieties from another edition. We have many traces of this practice in **A** and **P**^A^. In *Pseud.* 864, for instance, one version had at the end of the line *conquiniscito* (**A**); another had *ceueto simul* (Nonius). In **P**^A^ (or its original) stood *ceueto simul* with *conquiniscito* written either in the margin or above *ceueto*, whence the reading of the minuscule MSS.: *conquiniscito simul*. In *Pseud.* 392 one version of the line appeared in **P**^A^: *ex multis, exquire ex illis unum qui certus siet*, the other version: *ex multis, ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo* had apparently in the original of **A** the marginal variant *exquire*, which has produced in **A** this curious line: *ex multis atque exquire ex illis paucis unum qui certust cedo.* On the strength of some cases of agreement

[1] Of the four passages of Plautus cited in this Dictionary with variants, three are preserved both in **P**^A^ and **A**. In each of these three one variant appears in **A**, the other in **P**^A^.

in what seem to be errors of text, the theory has been formulated that A and P^A were closely connected, both coming from one and the same original (not necessarily an immediate original) which had its margins supplied with variants, and that the points of difference between A and P^A are due to the scribes of the two MSS. having selected their text now from the margin, and now from the text of this common original. (See Leo, *Plaut. Forschungen*, chap. i.) Some theorists have even gone so far as to specify the number of lines on each page of this supposed original with the help of seeming lacunae in A and P^A. And yet, if we consider how numerous must have been the copies of Plautus in the Empire, especially after the study of the old Republican writers became the fashion, it is scarcely credible that our two MSS., the one apparently Italian, the other probably French, should be so closely related. The whole tenor of recent Plautine study has shewn that what seemed at first sight to be errors common to A and P^A have usually turned out to be genuine readings, and that the safest rule for an editor is to accept any reading supported by both A and P^A, unless there is clear possibility of the scribe of A and some scribe of a Palatine archetype, whether of P^A or P or P^{BD}, &c., having fallen separately into the same mistake. There may be a few scribal errors which were present in some very early edition of Plautus, and which have found their way by direct transmission into both A and P^A, but they are unlikely to be much more numerous than the misprints repeated for some generations in editions, let us say, of Shakespeare or Milton. A study of the divergent readings of A and P^A leaves the impression rather of two different editions which had in many passages been assimilated through the adoption by one of some readings of the other, than of two copies of the same edition which were beginning to exhibit points of dissimilarity[1].

[1] A list of divergent readings of A and P^A will be found in Niemeyer, *de Plauti fabularum recensione duplici*, Berlin, 1877 (cf. Baier, *de Plauti fabularum recensionibus Ambrosiana et Palatina*, Breslau, 1885). The list is capable of improvement. Some readings are attributed to P^A, which the evidence of T shews to be mere errors of P; some readings assigned to A will be struck out after reference to Studemund's Apograph. The aim of both treatises is to decide whether A or P^A is the better authority for the text of Plautus. It is now generally admitted that both MSS. had their strong and weak points, and that each reading must be judged on its own merits. The passages quoted by Nonius from Plautus have been collected by Caesar, *de Plauti memoria apud Nonium seruata*, in vol. xi. of the *Dissertationes Philologicae Argentoratenses*, Strassburg, 1894. Here too the readings must be tested by a reference to Onions' edition of Nonius i.—iii. (Oxford 1895), and by consideration whether this or that reading is not rather to be regarded as a mistake of a mediaeval scribe than as the actual text of Nonius. For the Plautine passages quoted by Festus, see Leidolph, *de Festi et Pauli locis Plautinis*, Jena, 1883.

19. For a history of the vicissitudes of the text of Plautus in antiquity, prior to the composition of **A** and **P**[A], our materials are too few. The variant readings already alluded to are to be referred partly to the work of scholars like Varro and Valerius Probus, partly to re-castings by stage managers for the convenience of an audience such as that addressed in the prologue to the *Casina* (vv. 11 sqq.):

> nam postquam populi rumore intelleximus
> studiose expetere uos Plautinas fabulas,
> anticuam eius edimus comoediam,
> quam uos probastis qui estis in senioribus;
> nam iuniorum qui sunt non norunt, scio[1].

Even the question whether the first collected edition of Plautus' plays was made in the time of Varro (Usener in *Nachricht. Götting. Gesellschaft* 1892, p. 201) or in the time of Valerius Probus (Leo *Plautinische Forschungen*, chap. i.) cannot be settled from the evidence at our disposal.

II. PROSODY.

The difference between the Prosody of Plautus and the Prosody of the Augustan poets is due to two causes:

(1) Certain syllables were pronounced differently in the time of Plautus and in the Augustan age;

(2) Plautus uses the ordinary colloquial forms of everyday life, whereas the diction of Augustan poetry was in great part an artificial language, with artificial forms, like our pronunciation of the Noun 'wind' in poetry so as to rhyme with 'mind.'

A. **Early Latin Peculiarities.** The peculiarities of Plautine Prosody which belong to Early Latin, as opposed to Classical Latin pronunciation, are these:—

1. Many final syllables were long by nature (i.e. contained a long vowel) in the time of Plautus, which came later to be pronounced with a short vowel, viz.:—

[1] For a quotation of the whole passage see the note on the prologue of the *Captivi*.

[redacted]

-at of *curat* &c. (3 Sg. Pres. Ind.), of *dicat, moneat* &c. (3 Sg. Pres. Subj.), of *curabat, dicebat* &c. (3 Sg. Imperf. Ind.);

-et of *splendet* &c. (3 Sg. Pres. Ind.), of *curet* &c. (3 Sg. Pres. Subj.), of *dicet* &c. (3 Sg. Fut. Ind.), of *esset, curaret, faceret* &c. (3 Sg. Imperf. Subj.), of *curavisset, fecisset* &c. (3 Sg. Pluperf. Subj.);

-it of *audit* &c. (3 Sg. Pres. Ind. 4 Conjug.), of *possit* &c. (3 Sg. Pres. Subj.), of *curavit, meruit, dixit, fecit* &c. (3 Sg. Perf. Ind.), of *fuerit* &c. (3 Sg. Perf. Subj.).

But not *-it* of *dicit* &c. (3 Sg. Pres. Ind. 3 Conjug.), of *erit, curabit* &c. (3 Sg. Fut. Ind.), of *fuerit, curaverit* &c. (3 Sg. Fut. Perf. Ind.). The *i* in these forms was short like the *i* of 2 Sg. *dicis, eris, curabis, fueris* (Fut. Pft.), *curaveris* (Fut. Pft.), or of 2 Pl. *dicĭtis, eritis, curabitis, fueritis* (Fut. Pft.), *curaverĭtis* (Fut. Pft.). Some Verbs in *-io* of the Third Conjugation belonged in the time of Plautus partly to the Fourth (cf. *cupiret* Lucret. i. 72), so that we have *facīt* Truc. 555, *percipīt* Men. 921, *facis* Amph. 555, *cupis* Curc. 363 (cf. Truc. 61). *Venibīt* Men. 1160 (AP) is better explained as a case of 'syllaba anceps in pausa' (§ 43) than by the confusion of Fut. Pft. and Pft. Subj. forms in Latin, e.g. *fecerīmus* (Fut. Pft.) Catull. v. 10.

The vowel in these terminations was originally long. *Stat*, for example, had the long *a* of Greek ἵ-στāτι (Att. ἵστησι), *curat* of Greek τίμāτι (Att. τιμᾷ). But the Romans found it difficult to keep up the long sound of the vowel before a final *t*[1]; and Plautus' younger contemporary Ennius treats these final syllables as 'half-long,' capable of being scanned either long (*ponebāt*, Enn. *A.* 288 M., *essēt A.* 81 M.), or short (e.g. *mandebăt A.* 138 M., *potessĕt A.* 235 M.).

Dăt (Most. 601, Men. 101) has, like *dās* (Poen. 868), a long vowel in Plautus (*Archiv Lat. Lexikogr.* xi. 127). (See also *Latin Language*, iii. § 49; and for details of Terence's scansion of final *-t*, Podiaski, *Troch. Sept. Terent.* pp. 7 sqq.) That this 'half-long' pronunciation was already established in Plautus' time is unlikely. The few apparent instances of short scansion are in all probability illusory, *exconcinnauĭt* Cist. 312, *fecĭt* Bacch. 665, *monstrĕt* Rud. 212.

-ar of *monear, dicar* &c. (1 Sg. Pres. Subj.), of *calcar*[2] &c. (Neut. Sg. of Adj. in *-āris*);

-er of *mater* &c. (Nom., Voc.[3] Sg. of R-Stems), of *curer* &c. (1 Sg. Pres. Subj.), of *curarer, monerer* &c. (1 Sg. Imperf. Subj.);

-or of *orator, splendor* (older **splendōs*), &c. (Nom., Voc. Sg. of R-

[1] Just as we find it difficult to give the *o* of 'note' the same long sound as the *o* of 'node.'

[2] *Calcār(e)* (*ferrum*), lit. 'the iron attached to the heel.'

[3] In the Voc. the short vowel should appear (Gk. μῆτερ). But it seems that the Romans used the Nom. form instead of the Voc. in these R-stems, so that Plautus would scan *matĕr* Voc., as *sorōr* Voc. (e.g. *Poen.* 364).

and S-Stems), of *curor*, *moneor*, *dicor* &c. (1 Sg. Pres. Ind.), of *curantor*, *dicuntor* (3 Pl. Pres. Imperat.).

But *-tur* of *curatur*, *curetur*, *legitur* &c. (3 Sg. Pres.) had always a short vowel, originally ŏ (Gk. ο of ἐ-λέγε-το &c.), then ŭ. The derivation of *igitur* is unknown; also of *mulier* (*muliĕr es* Mil. 1223, v.l. *mulieris*).

The vowel in these terminations, too, was originally long. *Orator* had the long *o* of ῥήτωρ, *dicor*, *dicuntor* of *dico*, *dicunto*. But final *r* exercised the same shortening effect on a preceding long vowel as was exercised by final *t*, though not perhaps so rapidly. Ennius seems not to know the short scansion (? *sudŏr A.* 455 M.); but it is the scansion of Lucilius (e.g. *stridŏr Inc.* 90 M., *fruniscŏr* xviii. 3 M.). Final *n* did not affect the quantity of a preceding long vowel, e.g. *audīn*, Asin. 598 &c., *spondēn*, from *audīs-ne*, *spondēs-ne*, *sanūn* from *sanūs-ne* (as in the iambic line-ending *sanūn es?* Truc. 364); but final *l* had this effect after the time of Plautus, e.g. class. *animăl*.

This -al of *bacchanal*, *animal* &c. was originally *-āle* (Neut. Sg. of Adj. in *-ālis*), and in Plautus' time these words had probably the accent on the final syllable (App. § 7) and retained the long vowel, *animāl*, &c.

Examples of these scansions are: *amōr* Merc. 590, *sorōr* Poen. 895 (for a fuller list see C. F. Müller, *Plaut. Prosodie*)

ita mi in pectore átque in corde fácit amōr incéndium.
eódem quo sorṓr illius áltera Anterástilis.

Whether *ĕcastōr* may be the Plautine scansion is not clear. See *Poen.* 1176, *Truc.* 315, 583, *Mil.* 1041 (at the diaeresis), *Cist.* 15. Analogy points to *-ŏr*.

2. Others were long by position (ending in a double consonant) in the time of Plautus, while in Class. Latin they took exclusively the pronunciation (with a single consonant) which at an earlier period they had only before a word beginning with a consonant. Thus while Plautus and his contemporaries pronounced *miless impransus* and *miles pransus* (cf. *hocc erat* and *hoc fuit*), the later usage recognized only the pronunciation with one *s* (*Lat. Lang.* iii. § 50).

es of *miles*, *sospes*, *dives* (Nom. Sg. of T-stems), of *es*, *prodes* &c. (2 Sg. Pres. Ind.);

os of *impos* &c. (with *s*(*s*) for *ts*);

Also *ter* (for **ters*; cf. *terruncius*); *cor* (for **cord*), etc.

How far the spelling *miless* &c. was in vogue is impossible to say[1]. The MSS. of Plautus point to *ess*, 'thou art,' in *Rud.* 240 and

[1] On the oldest Latin (and Greek) inscriptions a double consonant is always written single, though of course pronounced double. But about the time of Plautus the new fashion of writing it double was coming in (*Lat. Lang.* i. § 8).

[redacted]

Merc. 489; and this spelling actually occurs on an inscription (*Carm. Lat. Epigr.* 1038. 5). Even Propertius scans the word long by position (ii. 32. 61):

Quod si tu Graias tuque es imitata Latinas.

But we find *milĕs* in Ennius (*A.* 277 M.) and Lucilius (xi. 8 M.).

Here are some examples of these words in Plautus:

Aul. 528 *Milĕs* impransus ástat, aes censét dari.
Poen. 388 Húius *cŏr*, huiús studium, huius sávium, mastígia.
(Cf. *Pers.* 800 and see Buecheler in *Rheinisches Museum*, 1891.)
Bacch. 1127 Rerin *tĕr* in ánno tŭ hás tonsitári? (Bacch.)
Cas. 629 Éripite isti gladium quaé suist *impŏs* animi. (Choriamb.)
Cas. 817 *Sóspĕs* iter incipe hoc uti viro tuo. (Ion. a maj.)

The final syllables above enumerated were definitely long in the time of Plautus[1], as at a later time they were definitely short. Other differences, however, between Plautine and Augustan prosody do not rest on so clearly marked distinctions, but rather on a difference of usage:—

3. **Final s** after a short vowel was so faintly pronounced in the time of Plautus and Ennius that poets felt no necessity to treat as long by position a syllable of this kind when followed by an initial consonant[2]. But by Cicero's time this pronunciation had come to be thought 'subrusticum' (*Or.* xlviii. 161) and ceased to be recognized in poetry (see *Lat. Lang.* ii. § 126).

For a discussion of the long and the short scansion of such syllables in Plautus and the early poets see Havet in *Études dédiées à G. Paris*, Paris, 1891; Skutsch in *Jahresbericht Romanischer Philologie*, iv. 82, Maurenbrecher, *Hiatus und Verschleifung*, pp. 89 sqq.

Priŭs is the normal preconsonantal scansion in Plautus, and similarly *magĭs*, *nimĭs*, *satĭs* (see Leo, *Plaut. Forschungen*, p. 268). Line-endings like *estĭs vos*, *occidistĭs me* (Bacch. 313) &c., are common enough. Examples of the long scansion are, *Rud.* prol. 1—2 (spoken by the god Arcturus):

qui géntes omnes, máriaque et terrás mouet,
eiús sum ciuis, ciuitate caélitum,

and in *Most.* 957 the line-ending *eiús pater*. The long scansion may be taken for the more ceremonious or careful style of speaking.

[1] It is wrong therefore to speak of a scansion like *matĕr*, *prodes(s)* as an occasional licence. For Plautus the final syllables must be scanned long and cannot be scanned short, unless under the influence of the Law of Breves Breviantes. Thus *pătet*, *pŏtes* may exhibit a shortened final syllable, but not *māter*, *prōdes*, just as the final *ō* of *dăto* may be shortened, but not of *stāto*. The Imperative *fer* was at all times a short syllable (*Lat. Lang.* viii. § 58).

[2] In Latin Dramatic Verse this scansion is not indicated in our printed editions, whereas in Epic Poetry, &c. *-ŭs* before a consonant is conventionally expressed as *-u'*.

Leo's theory that final *s* may be elided (like final *m*) before an initial vowel is supported by strong arguments (*Plaut. Forsch.* pp. 224 sqq.). The spelling *-est* for *-is est*, e.g. *qualest* for *qualis est*, *similest* for *similis est*, is one piece of evidence adduced by him. But the theory seems to be unlikely on 'à priori' grounds and to have no certain instances in the lines of Plautus to vindicate it (see Maurenbrecher p. 98). On *factust* for *factus est*, &c., see below, § 12.

Similarly in words or word-groups like *sanusne* (*sanun*), *priusquam* (*prius quam*) &c., we find the short scansions *sanŭn* (§ 1), *priŭsquam* (seldom *priūsquam*, with second syllable long by position), e.g. Enn. *Trag.* 239 R. (in a prayer):

Ínspice hoc facinús priúsquam fiat: prohibessís scelus;

a scansion like *nimisque* is not found (Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.* p. 268).

The incidence of ictus on the syllable is quite consistent with the short scansion (§ 29), e.g. *dictŭs Prometheus* in an anapaestic line of Accius (*Trag.* 534 R.). So scan *Amph.* 903 *nimĭs uerecunda es.*

4. **-ulus** and **-lus**, **-ulum** and **-lum** have somewhat different usage in the literary language of Plautus' and of Virgil's time. When a vowel originally preceded *l* in these terminations, Plautus does not allow the syncopated form. The Diminutive Suffix *-culo-* (originally *-co-lo-*), for example, never appears as *-clo-* in his lines: e.g. *melculum*, not 'melliclum,' in *Cas.* 837; *osculi*, not 'oscli,' in *Stich.* 91. When the vowel is a later insertion, to facilitate pronunciation, this extended form is not as readily allowed as the older form which lacked the parasitic vowel: e.g. *vehiclum* (originally *-clom*, from *-tlom*; cf. Gk. ἄν-τλον, ἐχέ-τλη) is invariable, never *vehiculum*; *perīculum*, &c., where a long syllable precedes the termination *-clom* (*-tlom*), is allowed only (but cf. *Pers.* 524, *Rud.* 169) at the end of a line, i.e. through metrical necessity:

Capt. 740 períclum vitae méae tuo stat perículo.

We must therefore read *passerculum* (with Diminutive suffix *-co-lo-*) in *Asin.* 666; *melculum* (with Dim. suffix) in *Curc.* 11; *uxorcula* (with Dim. suffix) in *Cas.* 917; *oraclo* (with suffix *-tlo-*) in *Men.* 841; *tabernaclum* (with *-tlo-*) in *Amph.* 428; *celocla* (*celōc-lā-*) in *Mil.* 1006; *circos*, not '*circlos*' (*circo-lo-*) in Accius *Trag.* 100 R.; *mundulos*, not '*mundlos*' in *Truc.* 658. (For fuller details see *Classical Review*, vi. 87.) Plautus uses the older form *poplus* (cf. *Popli-cola*) as well as the classical *populus*, e.g. *Pseud.* 126, *Stich.* 490—2.

See Studemund (in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher* cxiii. 64) for examples of *extempulo* at the end of the line in Plautus. '*Hercule*' (Asin. 275, &c.), '*exempulum*' (Asin. 389) are doubtful.

5. **Other 'early' forms.** *Frustrā*, *contrā* were the Adverbs in use in the time of Plautus; *frustrā*, *contrā* (altered to the type of *extrā*, *suprā* &c.), in the Augustan age (for details see Wölfflin in *Archiv Lat. Lexikogr.* ii. 1); just as *collus*, *vŏcīvus* were the Plautine, *collum*, *vacuus* the Augustan forms. Beside *săcer* (*săcro-*, 2 Decl.)

[redacted]

Plautus and his contemporaries used a form *săcer* (*săcri-* 3 Decl.), e.g. *porci săcres*, 'pigs for sacrifice,' *Rud.* 1208 (cf. *Men.* 290). Cf. *rūbidus* Cas. 310, Stich. 228; *rūbrica* Truc. 294; *tēgillum* Rud. 576 (Aul. 301). *Defrūtum* (Pseud. 741) is the Plautine, *defrŭtum* the Virgilian form (see Hilberg in *Zeitschr. oesterreich. Gymnas.* xxviii. 37). '*Homōnis*' &c. is now generally abandoned as un-Plautine.

We have evidence of *stătim* (*Lat. Lang.* ix. § 4); and *stātus*, the Noun, is found (*Mil.* 1389), usually *stătus*. But whether *dātor* may be admitted in *Truc.* 571 beside the usual *dător* is doubtful. On *ibīdem*, rarely *ibĭdem*, see § 16 *n.*

The Pronoun *egō* (e.g. Aul. 457, Cist. 745, Truc. 357, 454) was still found along with the usual scansion *egŏ* (e.g. in line-endings like *ĕt egŏ uos* Mil. 1138; see Seyffert in Bursian's *Jahresber.* 1894, p. 260); whereas only the pyrrich forms appear to have been tolerated of the Adverbs *bene*, *male*, *ita* (§ 16). The older Datives *quoīī*, *hūīc* were not wholly supplanted by the monosyllabic pronunciation *quoi* or *cui*, *huic* (see the next paragraph). In the Ablative and Accusative *mēd*, *tēd*, but probably not *sēd*, were used along with *me*, *te* (*se*); though in longer words final *d* after a long vowel had been completely lost in pronunciation before the beginning of Plautus' literary activity.

Possibly also the monosyllabic Noun *rēd* (Abl.), *Aul.* 141, *Merc.* 629, *Pseud.* 19, Pacuvius *Trag.* 237 R. (see *Archiv lat. Lexikographie* x. 550). *Sēd* is found (with *sēsēd*) on old inscriptions. These old Pronoun case-forms in *-d* (cf. Maurenbrecher *Hiatus* 118) have been often, though not always, 'modernized' by the scribes of our MSS., except where some accident led to their preservation, such as the confusion of *ted esse* with *te desse* (*deesse*). Where the metre shews that *se* is the wrong form (e.g. *Asin.* 583), editors rightly prefer to substitute *sese* (which is often mis-copied as *se* by scribes, e.g. *Curc.* 298) rather than *sēd*; for we have not the same indication of the form *sēd* as we get of the forms *mēd*, *tēd* in our MSS. The restoration of the older ending *d* to Ablatives (e.g. *agrod*, Amph. 193?), Adverbs (e.g. *porrod*, *introd*) or Imperatives (e.g. *datod*), that contain more than one syllable, is a practice followed occasionally by editors in imitation of Ritschl, but is almost certainly wrong (see *Lat. Lang.* ii. § 137; Maurenbrecher *Hiatus* p. 129). The Nom. Sing. of the Demonstrative *hĭc* is probably never a long syllable when the next word begins with a vowel (scan *hĭc* in Amph. 300, Capt. 547, &c.; see § 32).

The Preposition *rĕ(d)-* (cf. Luc. Mueller *Res Metr.*[2] p. 448) retains its full length in the by-forms *redduco* (normal), *reddux* (in two Bacchiac lines, *Capt.* 923, *Rud.* 909; otherwise *rĕdux*), *rellatum* (Phorm. prol. 21), &c., but *rĕcido* Men. 520. *Pro* in Composition shews both the long and the short vowel, not always in accord with the classical usage, e.g. *prŏtervus* Amph. 837, &c. (For details see *Lat. Lang.* ix. § 45; cf. note on *Capt.* 923.)

But *-ā* in Nom. Sing. of 1 Decl. and Nom. Acc. Plur. of Neuter Nouns is unknown to Plautus and Terence, even in loan-words from the Greek, so that the scansions *familiā* (Trin. 251), *epistulā* (Asin. 762), *liberā* (Epid. 498; cf. § 34), and even *Samiā* (Eun. 107), *Sosiā* (Amph. 439), must be abandoned. In the Vocative of Greek Names like *Sosias*, *Leonidas* the long *a* seems to be found, e.g. *Leonidā* (Asin. 740), if the reading of the MSS. be correct. In the Abl. Sing. of the 3 Decl., where a long final vowel is required by the metre, we should change *-e* of the MSS. to *-i*; for *-ĕ* and *ī* appear to have been the Ablative forms in use in Plautus' time, never *-ē*. The few apparent examples of *-ē* in the Infinitive (*Lat. Lang.* viii. § 85) are probably illusory (see § 34). The Abl. Plur. in *-būs*, apparently offered by the MSS. in some passages (cf. § 34), is certainly impossible. In the First Decl. the ending *-as* is not found in the Nom. Plur. (in Trin. 539 *alternas* Adv. or *alternis* Adv. should be read) nor (with the exception of the legal form *familias* in the phrases *pater familias*, &c.) in the Gen. Sing. The old Gen. Sing. ending *-āī* is found along with its classical shortened form *-ae*. Notice that *-ae* Gen. is perhaps never elided, while elision of *-ae* Dat., *-ae* Nom. Plur. (and *-ae* Loc. Sing.) is frequent (Leo *Plaut. Forsch.* 312; criticised by Skutsch in *Jahresber. Roman. Philol.* iv. 84). (For details on these endings see *Lat. Lang.* ch. vi.)

6. **Vowel preceding vowel in same word.** That a long vowel or diphthong before another vowel tended to be shortened in Latin we see from forms like *prĕhendo* for *prae-hendo*, *dĕerro* for *dē-erro*. How far the forms sanctioned by the Augustan poets tallied with those of current pronunciation and with those admitted into the earlier poetry, is not easy to discover. Servius (ad Virg. *Aen.* i. 451) says that *audīit*, *lenīit* were the forms of current usage. Quintilian (I. v. 18) declares *unīus* to be the only form of the Genitive in actual use ('unīus'...extra carmen non deprendas). The scansions *illĭus*, *istĭus* &c. are usually denied for Plautus, although his usual practice with originally long vowels that precede other vowels seems to be to admit both the long and the short quantity (but only *platĕa*, *balinĕae*, &c.).

In Plautus we find occasionally such scansions as:

(*a*) *-īi*, *-īero*, e.g. *īero* Capt. 194 (q. v.), *īerant* Ad. 27, *audīeras* Phorm. 573, *audīerit* Hec. 813. *īerant* is attested by Donatus in his note on Terence *Ad.* 27 (I. i. 2): producte i pronuntiando, quod nos addita v 'iverant' dicimus.

(*b*) *-ūi* in the Perfect of Verbs in *-uo*, e.g. *institūi* Most. 86, *perplūit* Most. 164, *plūerat* Men. 63, *fūit* Pers. 168, *fūisse* Bacch. 5.

The statement of C. F. Müller (*Nachträge*, p. 84) that *fūi*, *fūit* are only allowed at the end of the line or hemistich, is incorrect (see Seyffert in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, xviii. 1557). *Adiūero* (or *adiūro*, *Lat. Lang.* viii. 48) for *adiūvero* (cf. *Most.* 691) occurs in *Phorm.* 537:

fieri miserum, quí me dudum, ut díxti, adiuerit cómiter,

as well as in *Rud.* 305, Ennius *Ann.* 386 M. *O Tite siquid ego adiuero*, etc.

[redacted]

(*c*) *-ēi* in Gen. Sing. of Fifth Decl., e.g. *rēi* and *fidēi*, Aul. 121 (Bacchiac):

meái fidéi tuáique réi.

The Gen. Sing. of the Fifth Decl. had originally -ēī (cf. -āī of First Decl.). This became (1) *-ĕi*, e.g. *rĕi* (Men. 494, Hec. 807, &c.), *fidĕi*; but usually in Plautus (2) *-ei* (cf. *-ae* of First Decl.), e.g. *rei* (by some written *rē*), *fidei* (*fidē*, *fidī*). The Dat. Sing. had always *-ei* (cf. *-ae*, from original *-ai*, of First Decl.), until a new Dative form, unknown in the time of Plautus (e.g. *rēī* Dat., Lucr., *rĕī* Dat., Horace), was made on the pattern of the Genitive. (For details see *Class. Rev.*, x. 424.)

(*d*) *ĕī* (Dat. Sing. of *is*), usually *ei*; *hŭīc* (Dat. Sing. of *hic*), usually *huic*; *quoii* (Dat. Sing. of *qui*, *quis*), usually *quoi* or *cui*.

Curc. 544 ís Summanum sé uocari díxit, *ĕī* réddidi.

Bacch. 484 míhi discipulus, tíbi sodalis périit, *hŭīc* fílius.

Amph. 861 (spoken by Jupiter)

ego sum ílle Amphitruo, *quoí*(*i*) est seruos Sósia.

Other examples of the fuller form, apparently the more ceremonious and emphatic form, are: *ĕī* Aul. prol. 13, Cist. 138, &c.; *hŭīc* Men. prol. 40, Poen. 395, 1036, Rud. 1342—3 (in a legal formula). Whether *quoii* (*cŭī*) be printed before an initial vowel or *quoi* (*cui*) unelided, is a matter for an editor's choice in lines like *Amph.* 861 (just quoted), *Haut.* 685, Caecilius 261 R., Turpilius 116 R., Pomponius 146 R. The elision of *cui* in Plautus (? *Asin.* 94, *Trin.* 1061) is denied by many scholars; cf. Accius *Praet.* 30 R.:

quaéque agunt uigilántes agitantque, éa si *c*(*ui*) in somno áccidunt,

where some would make *ĕă sĭ cuĭ* a proceleusmatic (§ 13). It should be added that since linguistic justification of the scansions *ĕī*, *hŭīc* is not yet forthcoming, they cannot be accepted with perfect confidence.

(*e*) *Chīus* Adj., *Curc.* 78, *Poen.* 699 (for details see Buecheler in *Rhein. Mus.* 1886); *Pellaeus*, with short paenultima, *Asin.* 333 (with long, *Asin.* 397); *ēheu* (for details see Richter in Studemund's *Studien* i. 438), *fīeri*, *fīerem* (*fĭ-* allowed at end of line) are other examples of variation between the Plautine and the classical treatment of a long vowel or diphthong preceding another vowel in the interior of a word. And others, no doubt, remain to be discovered.

In Terence similarly the scansion *fieri*, *fierem* (e.g. *Phorm.* 593) is not admitted except at the end of the line (i.e. through metrical exigencies). See Hauler's note on *Phorm.* 760. '*Fīo*,' '*fīam*' is apparently unknown. Editors change '*fĭat*' of the MSS. to *fīat* in *Aul.* 405 &c. (cf. *Pseud.* 1029).

The *i* of *pius* was originally long. This quantity is attributed to Ennius (ap. Cic. *Rep.* i. 41. 64) *pectora pia tenet desiderium* (*MSS.* diu, dia) and may perhaps occur in Plautus (e.g. some scan *pietatem* in *Pseud.* 293, *Trin.* 280).

Proprius, from *pro* and *privus*, may retain long *i* in *Capt.* 863 (q.v.), *Merc.* 338, *Trin.* 1130; and possibly *prior* (the original scansion) is found in *Cas.* 571, 839,

Bacch. 932. Instead of *sŭis* (cf. *sūs* Nom.) in *Curc.* 323, editors read *sueris*; '*custodĭa*' of the MSS. they change to *custodela* (*Merc.* 233 and often; cf. Niemeyer on *Capt.* 457). *Dicaeum* (Gk. Δικαίαν), if this is the right form of the name, is an anapaest in *Mil.* 808, with the same shortening of a diphthong as in *prehendo*, *platea*, *balineae* (cf. *gynaecĕum*, Most. 759). Even *praehende* with long first syllable is not impossible in *Curc.* 339. Of the long scansions may be noticed *Dīana* Bacch. 812 (full details in Abraham *Stud. Plaut.* p. 216), *Dīus Fĭdius* Asin. 23. The verb *aio* shews divergence of scansion. In the Present we find usually *quid ăīs*, *quid ăīt* (see App. § 19), and in dialogue metres *ăīs*, *ăīt*, e.g. *Poen.* 1013, 1017, *Rud.* 1072, *Asin.* 285; but probably *a͡in* normally, though *āīn* may occur in *Amph.* 284 (cf. Leo ad loc.). In the Imperfect the uncertainty of the spelling in our MSS. leaves us occasionally an open choice between *aiebam* and *āībam* (*ăībam?*) for the longer by-form of disyllabic *a͡ibam*. (On these scansions in other poets see Luc. Mueller *Res Metr.*[2] p. 285.) *Quíd aīs tū* (an anapaest), *Poen.* 343, is an unlikely shortening (§ 16).

7. **Unsyncopated forms.** *Valide* (Most. 974, Pseud. 145) appears instead of *valde* (for details see Gehlhardt, *de Adverbiis*, Halle, 1892, p. 21); *purigo*, (*ob*)*iurigo* are older forms of *purgo*, (*ob*)*iurgo* (Ritschl, *Opusc.* ii. 426); *lāridum* (*lardum*, Lucil. ii. 14 M.) is the only form known to Plautus (cf. *balineae*, later *baln-*). Of *er* (and *r*)-forms *alterinsecus* seems to occur in *Merc.* 977, *sinistera* in *Merc.* 880 (*Eun.* 835), but *supera* (used by Lucretius; cf. *Inc. Trag.* 163 R.) is not established for Plautus (*Cas.* 815 is doubtful); much less '*altrum*' (scan *altĕrŭm* in *Capt.* 8 &c.), '*cetrum*': *dextera* seems to be used, e.g. *cedo tuam mi dexteram* Curc. 307, Merc. 149, as well as *dextra*, e.g. *cette dextras nunciam* Merc. 965. Of *u* (and *v*)-forms *lārua* is always a trisyllable in Plautus, but *Minerŭa* (Accius *Trag.* 127 R.) is open to doubt (see Schoell in *Arch. lat. Lexikogr.* x. 116 on *Bacch.* 893). On -(*u*)*l*- see § 4.

Add *opificina* (Mil. 880) for class. *officina*. But *Vid.* 17 is not sufficient evidence of '*usŭrĭpo*.' There is none of '*aevitas*' or '*aeviternus*.'

Acua for *aqua* is another doubtful Plautine form (cf. *Inc. Trag.* 111 R.; and see Schroeder in Studemund's *Studien* ii. 20). So is *acerŭos* (Cas. 126?), and *salŭos* (see Havet in *Mémoires Soc. Linguistique* vi. 115). Trisyllabic *solŭo* is more likely. Brock, *Quaest. Gramm.* p. 101, pleads for *consŭerunt*, &c. *Anticŭus* seems to occur in the post-Plautine prologue of the *Casina*, vv. 7, 13 (cf. *Bacch.* 261?). *Rĕlicuus* is the Plautine scansion (*reliquus* not till Persius).

Of syncopated forms the colloquial *ardus* for *aridus* is probably found in *Pers.* 266 (*Aul.* 297). Some would add *un'cus* in *Capt.* 321 (q.v.), *dom'nus* in *Cas.* 722 (see Leo in *Rhein. Mus.* xxxviii.), *Haut.* 628. *Surpui* for *surripui* occurs thrice in one play, the *Captivi*, but probably never '*surpio*,' '*surpere*,' '*surptus*,' &c. (*Journ. Phil.* xxvi. 296). *Porgo* is the Plautine form (*Pseud.* 708, &c.), probably not '*porrigo*' (? Merc. 883).

B. Colloquial Latin peculiarities.

8. Of the colloquial pronunciations admitted by the early

[redacted]

Dramatists, but excluded by the Augustan poets, many seem at first sight to be archaisms rather than colloquialisms, because they are found in other early poets. Disyllabic *e͡odem*, for example (§ 15), occurs in Lucilius (and in Lucretius too). But the truth is that the exclusion of colloquial forms and scansions from the language of elevated poetry was not fully accomplished till Augustus' time. The earliest poets took the language as they found it and applied to it the Greek laws of quantitative metre. A language with a stress-accent like the Latin did not readily adjust itself to the quantitative test. Many of its syllables, as pronounced in ordinary discourse, were not definitely long nor definitely short, but what modern phoneticians call 'half-long' syllables. A word like *abest*, when pronounced separately and with due regard to the spelling, would exhibit a second syllable long by position, but in the conventional utterance of a sentence like *non lónge abest hóc ab íllo* the word would sound as like a pyrrich as an iambus. Ennius required stricter rules of pronunciation for the language of elevated poetry than previous poets; and his strictness was maintained and increased by his poetical successors. But it took considerable time before poetical diction attained the severe regularity that it shews in the hands of the Augustan poets. Lucilius allows himself to scan *abĕst* (ix. 29 M.):

> 'r' non multum abest hoc cacosyntheton atque canina
> si lingua dicas 'nihil ad me,'

though Ennius in his Epic restricts this shortening to final vowels, e.g. *putŏ*, to the complete (or almost complete) exclusion of, e.g. *legŭnt*, and was followed in this restriction by his successors (cf. § 18).

But it would be a mistake to regard *abĕst*, *putŏ* as pronunciations characteristic of Plautus' time like *curăt*, *terrĕt*, *audĭt*, *dixĭt*. In ordinary discourse the words would be so pronounced in the time of Virgil as in the time of Plautus; but while Plautus admits these pronunciations of every-day life into his verse, Virgil and the Augustan poets exclude them. Though, however, they were excluded from elevated poetry, they were still allowed in Dramatic composition. Afranius, who belongs to the close of the Republican period, admits them as freely as Plautus.

9. The colloquial pronunciations allowed by Plautus, but refused by Virgil and poets of his class, are:

Suppression of v. This asserted itself so strongly in certain

words that the colloquial pronunciation was allowed to pass current even in the higher poetry; e.g. *prorsus* for *provorsus*, *ditiae*[1], *ditior* and *ditissimus* for *divitior* and *divitissimus*, *sis* for *si vis*, *audisti* (cf. *sisti* Mil. 1072 for *sivisti*) and the like for *audivisti*, &c. In Plautus we find also *obliscor* (cf. class. *oblitus*) for *obliviscor*:

Mil. 1359 múliebres morés discendi, oblíscendi stratiótici

(cf. Accius *Trag.* 190, 488);

dinus for *diuinus*:

Epid. 316 <Ut> dúm rem dinam[2] fáceret, cantarét sibi

(MSS. = P), cf. v. 419;

controrsia for *controuorsia*:

Men. 593 Aút plus aut minus quam ópus erăt dicto díxeram contrórsiam (AP).

These shew us suppression of *v* in the same circumstances as in *di(vi)tior*, *si(ui)s*, *audi(vi)sti*, *audi(ui)t*, *prō(vo)rsus*, viz. between ī-*i*, ō-*o*. Terence has the contracted Positive *dis* for *dives* (*Ad.* 770; cf. *Bacch.* 331 ?). In *aunculus*, the Plautine form[3] and, as we see from the Romance languages (Fr. *oncle*, &c.), the colloquial form at a later time also, we seem to have the same suppression of intervocalic *v* before the accented syllable, as shews itself in Vulg. Lat. *Noembris*, *noicius* for *Novembris*, *novicius* (see *Latin Language*, ch. ii. § 53).

Whether we should accept other alleged cases of the suppression of *v*, under circumstances for which we have not satisfactory parallels, is doubtful. Is the monosyllabic pronunciation of *nauis* sufficiently established by the consensus of AP in *Men.* 344:

Nunc in ĭstoc portu stát navis praedatória,

or should the line be emended? Cf. *Bacch.* 797 Bene náuis agitatur, púlcre haec confertúr ratis (agitur *edd.*), and perhaps Enn. *Trag.* 73 R. The MSS. strongly support disyllabic *uiuendi* in Terence, *Andr.* 52:

Libérius uiuendi fúit potestas, nam ántea,

but editors are suspicious of so curious a form.

Other still less certain examples are: *cla(ua)tor* Rud. 804, *ui(ui)mus* Stich. 695 (AP; bibimus *edd.*), &c.

[1] The *v*-form is not found in Terence, but is the prevalent form in Plautus. This is true of other instances where *v* is suppressed (§ 32).

[2] *Res deina* occurs on an inscription of Plautus' time (*C.I.L.* xi. 4766) *nesei quo die res deina anua fiet*, 'nisi quo die res divina annua fiet.' (For fuller details see Buecheler in *Rheinisches Museum*, xxxv. 627, Leo *ibid.* xxxviii. 2.)

[3] e.g. Aul. 799 *Éa re repudiúm remisit aúnculus causá mea.*
Only once, Aul. prol. 35 *Is adulescentis illius est auonculus* (MSS. = P), do we find the four-syllabled pronunciation which alone is tolerated by a poet like Virgil (*et avonculus excitat Hector*). Its occurrence, if the reading be right (some read *est illius aunculus*), and if the prologue be written by Plautus, may be explained like *periculum* beside *periclum* &c. (supr., § 4).

[redacted]

There is clearly assonance between *avidi* and *audi* in *Bacch.* 276:

Quin tu aúdi. Immo ingenium aúidi haud pernoram hóspitis,

(cf. Catullus xi. 1 *Rau(i)de*), but it is not the *v* which is suppressed but the following letter (cf. *audeo*, older *ăvideo* Rud. 538, 'to have a mind for,' then 'to dare,' from *avidus*). Cf. *nauta* (Mil. 1430) beside *nāvita* (Men. 226). Full details regarding the shortened form of the V-Perfect are given by Engelbrecht in *Wiener Studien* vi.; Brock, *Quaest. Gramm.* ii. The contraction of *-ivi-* is the commonest, e.g. *perīt*, *exīt*, *abīt* (App. § 8), *peri* (cf. *C. I. L.* iv. 3001 *perei*, a disyll.), &c. But *-āvit* probably did not contract. So not e.g. '*amât*' (cf. Lucr. i. 70; vi. 587) for *amāvit*, '*adnumeraut*' (wrongly read in *Asin.* 501 by Leo): *-āmus* for *-āvĭmus* is less objectionable, e.g. *enarramus* Ad. 365; cf. O. Lat. *nōmus*. That a contracted form like *peri* may elide its final vowel is not certain, e.g. *Bacch.* 51.

10. **Metathesis of r.** *Phyrgio* is apparently allowed by Plautus in *Aul.* 508:

Stat fúllo, phyrgio, aúrifex, lanárius,

though in all other passages the form used is *phrygio*. On the other hand *tarpessita* is perhaps the only form used, since *trapessita* seems never to be really required by the metre (in *Epid.* 143 we should probably read *quo a tarpessita*).

Other probable examples are *aruio* (Poen. 778) for *rāvio* (where however the alliteration favours *rāvio*), *prŏculena* (Mil. 1060) for *porculena*, *corcotarius* (Aul. 521) for *crŏcotarius*.

11. **Popular forms of some Greek words.** Certain loan-words from the Greek which were in every-day use are admitted by Plautus in what we may call their 'plebeian' or unliterary form. An uneducated Roman in pronouncing a Greek word put stress-accent on the same syllable on which the Greek accent (i.e. pitch-accent) rested, without concerning himself about maintaining the proper quantitative pronunciation of the syllables. Greek εἴδωλον became *idŏlum*, Σοφία became *Sofĭa*; *abyssus* (ἄβυσσος) is in Christian (popular) poetry scanned as a tribrach. This change of quantity is rigorously debarred by Augustan poets except in words in which it had established itself too strongly to be removed, e.g. *áncŏra* (ἄγκῦρα). Another 'plebeian' pronunciation of Greek gave to Greek χ a sound, whose precise nature is matter of doubt, but which had the effect of lengthening by position the preceding vowel. One mispronunciation of this kind which firmly established itself in Latin is *bracchium* for Gk. βράχῖον, lit. 'the shorter part of the arm' (from the shoulder to the elbow). In Plautus we see these mispronunciations tolerated in such words as had become part and parcel of the common language, while in all others the 'literary'

pronunciation is observed. The coin called after King Philip of Macedon is always scanned as a tribrach, *Phĭlĭppus* (Gk. Φίλιππος), in Plautus, just as we tolerate a mispronunciation of the word 'three' in 'threepence,' which is not tolerated in other combinations, e.g. 'three days,' 'three pounds.' But the name *Philippus*, when used as the name of a person and not as the name of a coin, has the 'literary' pronunciation (⏑ – ⏑)[1]. Beside *bracchium* Plautus admits *Accheruns*, and apparently *Acchilles*, e.g. *Merc.* 488:

> Ácchillem orabo, aúrum ut mihi det Héctor qui expensús fuit.

Acchilles may be the form exclusively used. (For details see Baier in *Philologische Abhandlungen zu Hertz*, 1888.) The scansion *Ăcheruns*ia, *Ăcherontem* seems to be found in Ennius *Trag.* 70, 203 R. (cf. *Ăcheruntis?* Inc. Trag. 77 R., but *Ăcherunte ibid.* 73): the first syllable is always long in Plautus. Perhaps *macchaera* (Pseud. 593) is the Plautine form (see *Harv. Stud.* ix. 126); but cf. Enn. *A.* 535.

But in words which had not so definitely been absorbed in the Roman language the correct quantity is observed, e.g. in personal names like *Eutўchus*, *Philolăches*.

Another familiar Greek word of the same form as Φίλιππος was τάλαντον, Lat. *talentum*. The scansion *talĕntum* is required by the reading of the MSS. (P) in *Mil.* 1061 (anapaestic metre):

Dabitúr quantum ipsus pretí poscet. Talentúm Philippi huic opus aúri est,

but in all other passages the second syllable of the word is long. On the loan-words *sagitta*, *satelles* and on *perinde*, see below, § 23.

The insertion of a parasitic vowel in those loan-words from the Greek which contained an un-Roman combination of consonants, e.g. *mina* (μνᾶ), *drachuma* (δραχμή), *Alcumena* (Ἀλκμήνη), may be mentioned under this head. Accius seems to have been the first to insist on the more exact reproduction of Greek names. (For details see Ritschl, *Opuscula*, ii. pp. 469 sqq.)

12. **Prodelision of 'es,' 'est,'** like our 'it's' for 'it is,' 'he's' for 'he is,' &c. Every page of Plautus offers forms like *facturu's* (with last syllable scanned long) for *facturus es* (*ess*), *facturust* for *facturus est*, *facturumst* for *facturum est*, &c., &c. These forms, or some of them, were current in poetry and prose of a later time also.

Leo doubts the contraction after any long syllable, e.g. *rest* (Cas. 578, Pers. 223) for *rēs est*, *Argentumdonidest* Pers. 120 for *-dēs est*, *sospest* for *sospes* (*-ess*) *est*. (For details see Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.* 255.) Skutsch doubts it after *-ss* for *-ts*, &c., e.g. '*sospest*,' but allows *rest* (*Jahresber. Roman. Philol.* iv. 81). These forms *facturust*, &c., some refer neither to 'prodelision of *e* of *est*' (the Roman Grammarians' explanation) nor to elision of final *s* before the initial vowel (Leo's theory), but to

[1] Even in *Pers.* 339, if *regis Philippi* may be supposed to form a word-group (cf. *rex Creo* &c. always in this order and never separated by an intervening word): *Mirúm quin regis-Phĭlĭppi causa aut Áttali* (cf. iii. § 7).

[redacted]

that tendency to suppress one of two similar neighbouring syllables, that we see in words like *voluntas* for *volunti-tas*, *Restutus* for *Restitutus*, &c. '*Illic'st*' for *illic est* (Truc. 121) would favour the first hypothesis; but the scansion is doubtful. While *-tis est* became *-ust*, *-is est* became *-est* (Leo, p. 258; cf. ad *Capt.* 518).

13. Shortening of long monosyllables joined to 'quidem.' In the Augustan poetry *sĭquidem* (e.g. *Truc.* 875) is admitted; but in Plautus we have other combinations which exhibit the same curious phonetic change, *tŭquidem* beside *tū quidem*, *tĕquidem* and *mĕquidem* beside *tē quidem* and *mē quidem* (cf. *sī quidem*, e.g. *Mil.* 28).

How it is to be explained is uncertain, though it seems to resemble the shortening of words like 'sheep,' 'know' in 'shepherd,' 'knowledge,' and of the first syllable of 'nation' in 'national,' a shortening due to the recession of the accent. Luchs, *Comment. Prosodiacae*, shews that *quidem* is an enclitic appendage of Pronouns, and that Plautus' normal accentuation is *égŏquidem*, *éăquidem*, &c. Nor is it certain how far the rule may be extended. *Sĭquis*, *sĭquid* are generally accepted by-forms of *si quis*, *si quid* (for details see Skutsch *Forsch.* i. 9 *n.*, Leo, *de Vidularia*, p. 5), e.g. Ter. *Andr.* 258, *Stich.* 182, *Aul.* 340:

> quód si ego rescissem id prius quid fácerem siquis nunc mé roget.
> nulli negare sóleo siquis me essúm uocat (P, om. *me* A).
> turba ístic nulla tíbi erit: siquid utí uoles,

though some would remove them in various ways, e.g. by substitution of *siqui* (cf. Ter. *Ad.* 521, where *si qui* and *si quid* are variants of the MSS.); cf. iii. § 7. And *hicquidem* (*hiquidem*) with short first syllable is the normal scansion, e.g. *Capt.* 823. (For details see Luchs, *Comment. Prosodiacae*, who adds that *illequidem* and *istequidem* are the only forms in use, not 'illicquidem,' 'isticquidem,' a fact which suggests *hiquidem* as the real form employed; cf. Seyffert in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, xviii. 978, and on *ĭdquidem* Seyffert, *ibid.* 1890, p. 309). *Quandŏquidem* is a classical Latin scansion, in which the word preceding *quidem* is not a monosyllable, as in these other examples. *Quĭquidem* seems to occur in *Poen.* 1213:

> Séd quis homost? Amícus uobis. Quí quidem inimicus nón siet

(cf. *Ad.* 268). If we allow *sĭquis*, *sĭquid*, it is difficult to refuse acceptance of *nĕquis*, *nĕquid*. We seem to have pyrrich scansion of *quidquid* in *Trin.* 218:

> und(e) quídquid auditum dícant, nisi id appáreat (hardly *-quid aŭdītum*; iii. § 7),

of *ecquis* (*equis*) in *Bacch.* 583 and many other lines (see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 46). Some scan *nŭmquid* in Merc. 282, *sĭcine* in Pers. 42, and so on (cf. iii. § 7). It is this principle of shortening which seems to explain *quăsi* beside *quam si*, *hŏdie* for *hō(c)-die*, but whether this explanation legitimizes a by-form *hŏdie* in Plautus (e.g. *Pseud.* 1071) is doubtful. (For fuller details see Buecheler in *Archiv lat. Lexikographie* iii. 144; Seyffert in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, 1890, p. 9.) In our present state of knowledge we can hardly feel perfectly certain of any shortening like classical *sĭquidem*, *quandŏquidem* excepting the closely analogous *mĕquidem*, *tŭquidem*, *tĕquidem*. These three are quite sufficiently guaranteed.

14. **Suppression of -ĕ** in certain pronouns, conjunctions, &c. Like *nec* beside *neque*, *ac* (i.e. **atc*) beside *atque*, *neu* beside *neve*, *dein* and *proin* beside *deinde*, *proinde*, we find in Plautus and the Dramatists *ill'* beside *ille*, *nemp'* beside *nempe*, *quipp'* beside *quippe*, *und'*, *ind'* beside *unde*, *inde*, *quiv'* for *quive* (*Amph.* 84), and so on. The forms without *-ĕ* occur before a word beginning with a consonant. Thus *nempe*, followed by a consonant-initial, never is scanned as a trochee; *quippe*, *ille* only when some emphasis is laid on them, &c., &c.[1] All these words are words which in ordinary discourse would not have much individuality assigned to them. They would be slurred over, and treated as subordinate words. In fact *ille*, in phrases like *ille senior*, *ille rex*, *ille revenit*, became the mere Definite Article or 3 Pers. Pronoun of the Romance languages (Ital. *il signor*, *il rè*, Span. *el señor*, *el re*, Fr. *il revient*). How far the suppression of *-ĕ* may be extended to other words in Plautus is not yet determined.

Such as *ant(e) posita* Rud. 509, *it(e) foras* Pers. 758, *it(e) si itis* Poen. 1237, *mitt(e) me sis* Pseud. 238, *mill(e) Philippum* Bacch. 272. The particle *-ne* became *-n* after a long vowel, e.g. *quin* for *quī-ne*. The particle *-ce* was reduced to *-c*, e.g. *illĭc*, *illīc*, *horunc*. Even in Nouns we find the loss of *-ĕ* in *animal* for *animale*, *calcar* for *calcare* &c. The old theory that *nempe* had a by-form *nĕpe*, and that *ille* was a pyrrich as well as an iambus, must be abandoned. (For full details see Skutsch, *Forschungen zur lat. Grammatik*, i.) Preconsonantal *ill(a)*, Fem. Sing. (originally *illā*), is unlikely. With *-qu(e)*, *-v(e)* we may compare the use of these Particles in Elision at the end of a line in classical poetry, e.g. Virg. *G.* ii. 344 *caloremqu(e)* || *Inter*, Hor. *S.* I. vi. 102 *perēgrev(e)* || *Exirem*.

15. **Synizesis** in certain words, e.g. *rei͡* (Lucr. iii. 931) and other Fifth Declension Genitives (above, § 6), *ei͡* Dat. (Catull. 82. 3), *deo͡s* (only through metrical necessity disyllabic; similarly *deo͡rum* &c. normally; see Abraham, *Stud. Plaut.* 204), *fui͡* (Lucil. xiv. 20 M.), *suo͡* (Lucr. i. 1022), *eo͡*, *eo͡dem*. With these we may mention the shortened forms of the Genitive of Pronouns, *huius* and *cuius* (monosyll.) (Lucr. i. 149; Virg. *Catal.* ix. 35), *illius* and *istius* (disyll.). Also *mi* for *mihi* and *nil* (the normal form) for *nihil*.

Some prefer to consider these as examples of the Law of Breves Breviantes and scan *dĕŏs*, &c., and even *dĕŏrum*, *ĕŏdem* (Skutsch in *Satura Viadrina*. Breslau, 1897). No doubt a word like *ĕō* (Pron., Adv., Verb) was capable of the scansion *ĕŏ*, and this seems the preferable scansion in a line like *Cas.* 715 *ĕŏ núnciam* (one of a

[1] Similarly *nam*, *non*, *hi*, *hos*, *illi*, *illos* &c. may be called preconsonantal, and *namque*, *nonne*, *hisce* (Nom. Pl. Masc.), *hosce*, *illisce* (Nom. Pl. Masc.), *illosce* &c. prevocalic forms, though this distinction is not invariably observed in each case.

succession of Iambic Monometers of the type ⏑⏑⏑́⏑–). But the Law of Breves Breviantes seldom operates with a final *s* (below, § 19), so that *ĕōs*, *dĕōs* (cf. Gk. θεῶν, monosyllabic), etc. are more likely scansions than *ĕŏs*, *dĕŏs*. And since Lucilius and Lucretius exhibit in their dactylic verse the scansion *e͡odem*, where '*ĕŏdem*,' in itself a most unlikely form, is definitely excluded by the metre, there is no reason for not ascribing the same scansion to Plautus. *Eodem* in *Poen.* 895, for example:

éodem quo sorór illius áltera Anterástilis,

can hardly be treated differently from, let us say, *eodem* in Lucil. iii. 43 M.:

huc catapeiraten puer e͡odem deferat unctum.

At the same time it must be allowed that these supposed contracted forms lack definite metrical proof. Monosyllabic *e͡o*, for example, is not found at the end of a line or hemistich (cf. iii. § 9), where its monosyllabic scansion would be put beyond possibility of doubt. The metre generally leaves us the option of scanning *ĕŏ*, &c., or *e͡o*, &c. Still *du͡as*[1] seems preferable in *Bacch.* 650 (apparently Cretic):

quí duas aut tris minas || aúferúnt eris,

di͡u and *su͡o* in *Stich.* 2ª and 2ᵇ (if these Dochmii conform to the type of their neighbours ⏓––⏑⏑⏓):

quae tam diu uidua
uiro suo caruit

(for *di͡u* cf. *Mil.* 628?); and on the other hand *sŭĭst* rather than *su͡ist* in the Choriambic line, *Cas.* 629:

éripite isti gladium quaé suist impós animi,

mĕăm rather than *me͡am* in the Glyconic, *Curc.* 155. Before a vowel (§ 40) the pyrrich scansion is indubitable, e.g. *mĕaĕ* in *Amph.* 1106 (Trochaic Septenarius):

nón dubito quin méae uxori látae suppetiaé sient.

On the whole it seems most likely that the three scansions *ĕō*, *ĕŏ* and *e͡o* were tolerated, just as three scansions seem to have been tolerated in the Dative Singular of the same Pronoun, *ēi*, *ĕi* and *e͡i* (also '*ĕĭ*'?) (above, § 6). The same doubt exists regarding the scansion of *diutius* (e.g. *Trin.* 685), the by-form (equivalent to a dactyl *di͡ūtĭŭs* or to a proceleusmatic *dĭŭtĭŭs*) of the fuller form *dĭūtĭŭs* (e.g. *Rud.* 93). In the case of the Possessive Pronouns the difficulty is increased by the possibility of a reduced form *mo-* for *meo-*, *so-* for *suo-*, &c., on which see *Lat. Language*, vii. § 12. Disyllabic *dei* and *deis* seem not to occur, *di* (from *diui*?) and *dis* (from *diuis*?) being the forms preferred (for details see Abraham, *Stud. Plaut.* p. 204). The common phrase *di deaeque* is normally trisyllabic (*de͡ae*). Similarly *i* and *is* (cf. class. *idem* and *isdem*) are the current forms of the Nom. and Dat., Abl. Plur. of the Pronoun, though *ei*, *eis* are occasionally found, e.g. *Merc.* 869. (Havet however in *Rev. Philologie*, 1892,

[1] In the Accus. Masc. *duo* is the equivalent of a long syllable, *duos* the iambic form in Plautus, according to Studemund in *Archiv lat. Lexikogr.* iii. 550.

p. 57 defends disyllabic *ii*, usually *ĭī*, and quotes IEI on old inscriptions; cf. *séd ĕidem homines* Mil. 758.) Examples of the *eodem*-type are: *Epid.* 157:

quíd hic nunc agimus? *eámus* intro huc ád te, ut hunc hodié diem.
Poen. 1422 Fáciam ita ut uis. Áge sis, *eámus*, nós curemus. Plaúdite.
Men. 690 *eándem* nunc repóscis: patiar. tíbi habe, aufer, útere.
Mil. 736 quí *deórum* consília culpet, stúltus inscitúsque sit.

The total elision of *eō* (Bacch. 298), *meō* (Capt. 495, Stich. 39), *suō* (Mil. 262), &c., is not free from doubt (see Skutsch in *Satura Viadrina*, p. 143).

The monosyllabic scansion of *huius*, *cuius* and the disyllabic of *illius*, *istius* are normal, unless the words are used with emphasis. The actual forms are now generally believed to have been *huis*, *illīs*, etc. (Luchs, in Studemund's *Studien* I. ii.). Whether the new theory has entirely driven out of the field the old explanation that **hui*, *cui*, *isti*, *illi*, the earlier Genitive (really Locative) forms, should be restored to some lines, to others the scansion *hŭiŭs*, *illĭŭs*, &c., is matter of opinion, though we certainly cannot well substitute *illi* or *illius* in a line like *Epid.* 447 (cf. iii. § 7):

suas púgnas, de illius íllae fiunt sórdidae.

Huiusmodi is normally a Cretic, *istiusmodi* a Spondee followed by an Iambus. The fuller pronunciation of the emphatic pronoun is seen in a line like *Poen.* 394:

óculus húius, líppitudo méa, mel húius, fél meum.

Under the Law of Breves Breviantes we certainly find *ĕiŭs*, *hŭiŭs*, with pyrrich scansion, e.g. Pacuvius *Trag.* 330 R.:

néque eius gnati párui, qui tibi ín tutelam est tráditus.

(Other examples are given by Luchs, e.g. Poen. 882 *mále eius mérito.*) Beside *fui* we have *fuisse* (e.g. Stich. 2; cf. Lucil. xvii. 5 M.), *fuere* (e.g. Stich. 581), &c. *Duellum* (disyll.), *perduellis* (trisyll.) are the normal Plautine forms (*duello* Amph. 189). *Puella* (always a trisyllable in Terence) may be the scansion in

Poen. 1301 nón pudet puellam ámplexari baíiolum in mediá uia?
Cist. 124 puellám proiectam ex ángiportu sústuli

(though some read *puerula* for *puella* both here and in *Cas.* prol. 79); and *puer sum* (cf. Lat. *Marcipor*, *Quintipor* for *Marci puer*, *Quinti puer*) is a possible scansion in *Merc.* 291 (cf. App. § 12). But to extend this treatment to all and sundry cases of *u* in Hiatus is of doubtful policy. The plebeian form *quattuor* (*quattor*) should not be foisted on *Most.* 630, for here the scansion *quattŭŏr* (dactyl) is permissible (iii. § 9), as in Enn. *A.* 90. More might be said for assigning this incorrect pronunciation to a 'plebeian' word like *battuo* (Vulg. Lat. *batto*) in *Cas.* 496:

quibus báttuatur tibi ós, senex nequíssime,

a line however which admits of other treatment (§ 24). *Fluctuatim* is a doubtful scansion in Afranius 237 R. (On *maluisti* of Lucil., *pueros* of Lucr., *pituita* of Horace, see Luc. Mueller *Res Metr.*[2] p. 298.)

Virgil makes somewhat free use of scansions like *aureō* (a spondee) (see Luc. Mueller *Res Metr.*[2] p. 325); but we are not bound to ascribe such forms to the Dramatists. There seems to be reason for recognizing *Diespiter* (Poen. 869), *diebus* (Poen. 1207), *quietus* (Epid. 338), *quiesco* (Merc. 448, Ennius *Trag.* 187 R.?; for other examples see Fleckeisen in his *Jahrbücher*, 1870, p. 77;

cf. *Nerei* Gen., *Epid.* 36). But *gratiis* in Capt. 408 (q.v.), *gaudiis* Capt. 840 should probably be scanned as dactyls, under the Law of Breves Breviantes (§ 25), not as spondees. Similarly in the Anapaestic Cantica such scansions as *aureā*, *gratiis*, *gratiā* (abl.) are now generally discarded for *aureă* (Curc. 139), *gratiīs*, *gratiă* (see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 281 sqq.). (On *victus* of Hor. and similar scansions in other than dramatic poets, see Luc. Mueller *Res Metr.*[2] p. 299. Ennius, *Ann.* 443, 91 M.,

> hic insidiantes uigilant, partim requiescunt,
> auium, praepetibus sese pulcrisque locis dant,

either uses Synizesis or allows an Anapaest in place of a Dactyl.) The shortening of *die* under the Law of Breves Breviantes (§ 16) in *Pers.* 260 is doubtful (Leo scans *ess*(*e*) *die*; cf. § 14). Of the curious suppression of *i* in Lucretius' *semine ŏr*(*i*)*undi* (ii. 991) no certain trace is found in Plautus (cf. *Poen.* 1055, *Stich.* 165).

The classical Latin forms are *cōēpi*, *cōegi*. Plautus uses occasionally the trisyllabic *coepi* (cf. Lucr. iv. 617), e.g. in the Bacchiac lines, *Cas.* 701, *Cist.* 687:

> nam quór non ego íd perpetrém quod cóépi?
> sed pérgam ut cóépi tamén, quaeritábo;

though the disyllabic *coegi* in *Bacch.* 981 is very doubtful:

> óptumus sum oratór; ad lacrumas hóminem coegi cástigando
> (coegi hominem *MSS.*; h. ad l. co. *Ritschl*).

The same divergence from the classical form of such compounds is seen in the contractions *coerce* of Pacuvius 48 (cf. 345) R., *cōnestat* (for *cohonestat*) of Accius 445 R., *deosculer* Cas. 136 (but *dĕamata* Truc. 703), &c. (cf. Luc. Mueller, *Res Metr.*[2] p. 294). The trisyllabic form *Cleostrata* (Cas. 393, 541, &c.) is taken from the Greek.

As regards intervocalic *h* the contracted pronunciation (not necessarily the spelling) of *cohibeo*, *prohibeo*, as well as of *debeo*, *praebeo* (*praehibeo*), is argued from the entire absence of an incidence of ictus on the second syllable. We find the ictus *adhíbeam*, *exhíbeam*, but never *prohíbeam*, *cohíbeam*. (For details see Abraham, *Studia Plautina*, p. 229.) *Mi* for *mihi* is to be found (unlike *mei* for *mei*, *meo* for *meo*) at the end of a line or hemistich where only monosyllabic pronunciation is possible, e.g. *Asin.* 614 *tu uita es mi* (cf. *Most.* 175, 871). Ritschl (*Opusc.* ii. 588; v. 514) laid down the rule that the form *mi* was not used by the Dramatists before a consonant, except occasionally in the thesis, while in non-dramatic verse (Ennius' *Annals*, Lucilius' *Satires*, &c.) it might be used in the arsis too. Ritschl however modified his views afterwards and came to acquiesce in e.g. *mi latitabat* Trin. 927. The scribes of our MSS. seem to have made a rule of writing *mihi* for the Personal and *mi* for the Possessive Pronoun (Voc.), so that the manuscript evidence does not go for much. Ritschl's restriction may be safely disregarded; in particular, we may write *mi* in Bacchiac Verse, where the pyrrich scansion of iambus-words is not favoured by Plautus (§ 34[a]). Disyllabic *nihil* is generally disallowed in Plautus, because there is no example of the word at the end of a line, where the metre would necessitate this form. But it occurs in Terence, *Haut.* 896, *Phorm.* 940:—

> Míra narras, quíd Syrus meus? né is quidem quicquám? Nihil.
> Etiám dotatis sóleo. Quid íd nostrá? Nihil,

and I see no reason for not accepting it in *Truc.* 696:

Iamné—nihil dico. I íntro, amabo, cédo manum.

(Cf. *nĭhĭli* Curc. 155?) (For more details see Birt in *Rheinisches Museum*, liv. 43.) *Dehinc* is never an iambus in the Comedians, e.g. *Ad.* 22 *dehinc ne éxspectetis árgumentum fábulae.* For *me(he)rcule* of Catullus (xxxviii. 2) and Phaedrus we have in Plautus *mehercle* (3 syll.), e.g. *Pseud.* 1175, *Stich.* 250 (see Sonnenschein's note on *Rud.* 1365). (On the syncopated form *ardus*, &c. see § 7.)

C. Law of Breves Breviantes[1].

16. This, the most characteristic feature of the prosody of Plautus and the Republican Dramatists, is apparently another point of colloquial Latin pronunciation. The law may be stated in this way. After a short syllable an unaccented syllable, long by nature or by 'position,' was pronounced 'half-long' and scanned by the Dramatists either long or short, when the accent fell on the following syllable or on the preceding (short) syllable. Whether the syllable was definitely shortened, or retained most of its proper long pronunciation, was a matter which depended on the nature of the word and the force of the accent (stress-accent) of the neighbouring syllable. The auxiliary Adverbs *bĕnē*, *mălē*, from their constant use in phrases like *bene-fáctum*, *male-fáctum*, *male-sánus*, &c. became definitely reduced to pyrrich words, and are invariably so scanned in Latin Poetry[2]. The auxiliary Pronouns *ĕgō* (Gk. ἐγώ), *mĭhī* (older *-hei*), *tĭbī* (older *-bei*), were in ordinary pronunciation (cf. *ego-díco*, *tibi-díco*, &c.) pyrrich words. So were subordinate Adverbs like *modo* (e.g. *modo-véni*), *cito*, *ibi*, *nisi* (the few instances of *nisī* in Plautus have been collected by Brock, *Quaest. Gramm.* p. 180). Quintilian tells us that *hăvē*, the salutation (e.g. *have-Claúdi*, *have-fráter*), was always pronounced *hăvĕ*[3], and *călē-fácere* always *calĕfacere* or even *calfacere.* Servius (*ad Aen.* vi. 779) says that *vidĕn* was the pronunciation of his time.

[1] I.e. breves (syllabae) breviantes (sequentes syllabas).

[2] That Plautus ever scans *benē*, *malē* is very doubtful. Of the instances quoted by Klotz (*Grundzüge*, p. 52) the least unlikely is *malĕ-hábiti* Pseud. 133, a scansion which would indicate an original *malē* (§ 38). *Ibĭdem* is normal (*ibīdem* Bacch. 756, Pseud. 1271). *Mihi*, *sibi* &c. are normal in the phrase *méus-mihi*, *súus-sibi* &c. (Scherer in Studemund's *Studien*, ii. 107). *Egŏ* is the normal scansion of Plautus, but *egō* is often found (§ 5). Of '*ită*' there is no sufficient indication (cf. *Amph.* 572, 635; *Capt.* 372).

[3] Quint. I. vi. 21: multum litteratus, qui sine aspiratione et producta secunda syllaba salutaret ('avēre' est enim) et 'calefacere' dixerit potius quam quod dicimus, his adiciat 'face' et 'dice' et similia. Recta est haec via, quis neget? sed adiacet et mollior et magis trita. So that Martial's *havē* (iii. 95. 1) is an 'artificial' pronunciation allowed in poetry merely. Similarly in Plautus *cavē* is found only in two Cretic Cantica (cf. § 34[a]), *Most.* 324, *Pseud.* 1296 (but *cavĕ* in another Cretic line, *Cas.* 627).

Similarly the Romance forms of a word like *mĭnistĕrium* (Ital. *mestiero*, Fr. *métier*, Chaucer's 'mistery') point to a pronunciation *minsterium*, a still further reduction of an earlier *minĭsterium*. And Cicero's story (*Div.* ii. 40. 84) of Crassus mistaking the cry of a fig-seller *Cauneas! Cauneas!* (sc. *ficus vendo*) for the warning *cave ne eas*, shews that *căvē* must have been pronounced *căvĕ*, or rather *cau* (cf. *neu* and *neve*), and that the whole phrase must have been uttered in some such way as *cáu(ĕ)-n(e)-eas*.

17. In the face of all this evidence it is hard to see how the old theory was ever accepted, that Plautine scansions like *cavĕ* (normal), *minĭsterium* (occasional), were due to the 'ictus of the verse' and had no existence outside of the metrical line[1]! The explanation of the shortening is plain. In all languages with stress-accentuation the syllable with weakest stress in a word or in a sentence is the syllable which immediately follows or immediately precedes the syllable with the strongest stress. In Latin, if this unaccented syllable consisted of a short vowel, its weakening took the form of Syncope; *jūrĭgo* (Plaut.) became *jūrgo*, *pūrĭgo* (Plaut.) became *pūrgo*: or change of quality; *áb-ăge* (Gk. ἄπαγε) became first *ab-ege* (cf. *abĕgit*, MSS. of Plaut. *Capt.* 814), then *abige*. If it shewed a long vowel it did not suffer this change (*Lat. Lang.* ch. iii. § 30), though it might if the length was length by 'position' merely, e.g. *talentum* for *tálantum* (τάλαντον). When preceded by a short syllable, the change it suffered was reduction of its length, from a long to a less long, a 'half-long,' or even a short syllable. In the sentence 'ex Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas' the strong stress thrown on the accented (short) syllable of the emphatic word *bonis* had the effect of making the second syllable sound as if it too were a short syllable like the first, so that Terence allows *bŏnĭs* in

[1] This strange idea that the beat of a line, the cadence marked by the conductor's baton (cf. *pollicis ictus* Hor.), could alter the quantity of the vowel of a Latin word has led to some surprising attempts at scansion in Plautus, such as the attempt to scan *amĭca* for *amica* in *Stich.* 700:

> †Ámica, uter utrubi áccumbamus? Ábi tu sane súperior
> (amica P, A n. l. Read *mica*, Imperat. of *micare*, sc. *digitis*),

erĭlis for *erīlis* in *Aul.* 599:

> †Érile imperium ediscat ut quod fróns uelit oculí sciant
> (MSS. = P; *eri ille* Wagner.)

It would, in fact, scarcely leave a single syllable safe which was preceded by a short syllable. Well may we characterize this type of scansion by a line constructed on the same principles:

> *Prósŏdiam quam pérŏdit Musa, inámoĕnam, pérhŏrridam, inŭtilem!*

this context to play the same metrical part in his line as *bŏnŭs* would (*Eun.* prol. 8):

Ex Graécis bonĭs Latínas fecit nón bonas.

The emphatic utterance of a short monosyllable (or elided disyllable) similarly obscured the unstressed initial syllable of the following word, e.g. *Merc.* 971 Vérum hic dicit. *Tíb(i) ĕrgo* dicit. *É(o) ĭllŭd* est verum magis, *Poen.* 881 *quíd ĕrgo* dubitas?

18. To what extent this assimilation of quantity to a preceding short syllable was carried out in pronunciation would depend partly on the speaker himself. An educated man would be less prone to slur or weaken his syllables than an uneducated. The same speaker in ordinary careless talk would pay less regard to their due, quantitative pronunciation than he would in formal, ceremonious discourse. To what extent it should be recognized in poetry was of course a matter for each individual poet to decide, though in the case of some words, as we have seen (e.g. *bene*, *male*), the power of decision was taken out of his hands; so strongly had popular usage declared for the shortened form. Ennius in his Epic Poetry restricts himself to the shortened pronunciation only of final vowels, in the weakening of which another factor was at work, viz. the shortened pronunciation of these before an initial vowel (below, § 38), and mainly the final vowels of iambic words (in *Ann.* 63 M. *ludicrĕ* is probably Neut. Sg. of a 3 Decl. by-form; cf. § 26), though we have occasional scansions like *virginĕs* (*Ann.* 102 M.; cf. Plaut. *Pers.* 845, if the reading be correct):

Virgines nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas.

Subsequent Dactylic Poets practise the same restriction and make more and more sparing use even of these shortenings. But every now and then they give us a glimpse of the real every-day pronunciation by their occasional departures from the rules of classical poetry; *abĕst* Lucil. ix. 29 M., *vidĕn* (Virg.), *cavĕ* (Catull., Hor., Ovid), *volŏ* (Catull. vi. 16), *dabŏ* (Catull. xiii. 11), *homŏ* (Lucr. vi. 652), *sciŏ* (Virg. *Ecl.* viii. 43, *Aen.* iii. 602), *eŏ* (Hor. *S.* i. 6. 119), *uetŏ* (Hor. *S.* i. 1. 104), *palŭs* (Hor. *A. P.* 65), *rogăs* (Pers. v. 134), *dixerŏ* (Hor. *S.* i. 4. 104), *mentiŏ* (Hor. *S.* i. 4. 93), *quomodŏ* (Hor. *S.* i. 9. 43), *ore cŏrrupto* (Lucil. ix. 1 M.), *natura cŏrruptum* (Lucr. vi. 1135).

And in the 'popular' dactylic poetry of Epitaphs and the like we have e.g. *sitŭst* (*C.I.L.* i. 1297), *rogăs* (i. 1454), *datŭr sp-* (i. 1453), *vehĭ* (i. 1442). So *potĕst* on a Pompeian Graffito (*C.I.L.* iv. 1824):

Si potest illa mihi tenerum pertundere pectus.

[redacted]

These pronunciations differed from the literary forms much as our every-day pronunciation 'of'n' differs from the more exact articulation of the spelling 'of-ten.'

19. Under what circumstances does Plautus admit the shortened pronunciations? They are found (to omit examples like *tibĭ*) in :—

(1) Iambic words (*a*) with naturally long vowel in final syllable —especially subsidiary Verbs of common use ending in a vowel, such as *cave* (e.g. *cauĕ-dícas*), *uolo* (e.g. *uolŏ-scíre*), *dabo* (e.g. *dabŏ-plágam*), *dedi* (e.g. *dedĭ-plágam*), and Nouns like *homo* (e.g. *homŏ-dóctus*), *domi* (e.g. *domĭ-réstat*), *domo* (e.g. *domŏ-pródit*). Next in order of frequency come some words in *-r*, *-t* (finals before which in subsequent poetry long vowels are invariably shortened), e.g. *moror*, *loquor*, *amat*, *negat*, *soror*, *minor*; while words in *-s* are rarely shortened (at least in the dialogue metres), e.g. *viros*, *bonos*, *foras* (e.g. *forăs-íre*), *fores* (e.g. *forĕs-púltat*), and words ending in a diphthong hardly ever, e.g. *nouaĕ-núptae*, *bonaĕ-frúgi*.

Statistics of the shortening of naturally long final syllables of iambic words in the dialogue metres (iambic and trochaic) of Plautus are given by Leppermann: *de correptione uocabulorum iambicorum quae apud Plautum in senariis atque septenariis iambicis et trochaicis inuenitur*. Münster, 1890. It need hardly be repeated now-a-days that the old explanation of *canĕs...turbinĕs* Trin. 835 as relics of an early Lat. Nom. Pl. in *-ĕs* (cf. Gk. κύνες, &c.) has long since been abandoned. The fantastic theory of Ecthlipsis, *c'nes*, &c., scarcely deserves mention. In Cretic and Bacchiac Cantica (§ 34[a]) the shortened forms are the exception. For details of *dedĭ* in *dedĭ-dóno*, &c., see Abraham, *Stud. Plaut.* p. 211. In Terence the Adverb is normally *modŏ* (see Hauler ad *Phorm.* 869).

(*b*) With naturally short vowel in final syllable. Lengthening by 'position' is dispensed with, especially in subsidiary words like *enim* (normally a pyrrich before a consonant-initial in Plautus and Terence; see Leo, *Plaut. Forschungen*, p. 303), *simul*, *tamen*, *quidem*, and the like. *Apud*, for example, before an unemphatic Pronoun like *me*, *te*, *nos*, *vos* bore the accent on the second syllable, and is scanned as an iambus, *apúd-me*, &c.; but was unaccented in collocations like *apud-ménsam*, *apud-témplum*, and is scanned as a pyrrich (cf. *apŭd forum*, e.g. Curc. 474 *ápŭd forum piscárium*; for details see Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.* p. 226, Skutsch in *Jahresber. Roman. Philol.* iv. 83. On *apŭd-nós*, with emphatic *nos*, see iii. § 11).

Similarly in the Dactylic Verse of Ennius, *non enĭm rumores ponebāt ante salutem* (*Ann.* 287 M.), *apŭd Cumas* (*Sat.* 56 M.).

20. (2) Polysyllabic words. A syllable with naturally short vowel is often not lengthened by 'position' before a consonant-group, when the following syllable (occasionally the preceding) bears the accent of the word, and when the preceding syllable is short, e.g. *minĭstérium*, *uolŭptátem*, *adŏptátus*, *ádŏptatícius* (Poen. 1045).

No matter what that group may be, e.g. **rn** in *gubĕrnábunt*, **nt** in *uolŭntátis*, **st** in *minĭstérium*, *uenŭstáti*, **ll** in *supĕlléctilis*, **ss** in *vicĭssatim*. It is wrong to say that the shortening is especially found before a double consonant, e.g. *ll*, *ss*, and to argue from the mere orthographical practice of writing a double consonant single in early Latin (as in early Greek) inscriptions that the pronunciation of a double consonant was weaker in the early than in the classical period. Nor does the division of the two consonants between different syllables, e.g. *r|n*, *n|t*, *l|l*, or the inclusion of both in the same syllable, e.g. *|st*, make any perceptible difference. Statistics of this shortening in polysyllabic words are given by Esch: *de Plauti correptione secundae syllabae vocabulorum polysyllaborum quae mensura iambica incipiunt.* Münster, 1897.

The instances of shortening a naturally long vowel in such words are very rare, but perhaps too well attested to be put aside, e.g. *pudĭcitiam* (Amph. 930, Epid. 405), *verĕbamini* Phorm. 902 (v. l. *veremini*), *Clytaĕmestra* Liv. Andr. *Trag.* 11 R.

Shortenings like *calĕfacere* are common enough. But they belong as much to the class of iambic words as of polysyllables. We may write *cale facere* (cf. Lucr. vi. 962 *et facit are*) or *calefacere*, as *bene facere* or *benefacere*. Cf. *diĕquinte* (Gell. x. 24), *vidĕlicet* (e.g. *Stich.* 557; but ē in *Asin.* 599). For a full list of instances like *pudicitia*, see Skutsch, *Iambenkürzung und Synizese* in '*Satura Viadrina*,' Breslau 1896. Esch however disallows them (cf. *Journ. Phil.* xxii. 1).

With these polysyllabic words we may associate

21. (3) Polysyllabic word-groups. The phrase *uoluptas mea*, 'my darling,' seems to have been pronounced as a single word, like *respublica* or *jusjurandum*, with accent on the antepenultimate syllable of the compound, i.e. on the last syllable of *voluptas*. The preceding syllable is invariably scanned short by Plautus, *uolŭptás-mea*. Similar word-groups that occasionally exhibit the action of the Law of Breves Breviantes are: *molĕstaé-sunt* (Mil. 69); *modĕstí-sint* (Trin. 831 *Sempĕr mendicis módĕsti sint*: Anap.); *quód ărgéntum?* in Curc. 613:

> Quód ărgentum? quas tú mihi tricas nárras? quam tu uír-
> ginem?

quíd-ăbstulísti? Aul. 645; *tíb(i)-ŏbtémperem?* Most. 896; *in-ŏccúlto* Capt. 83; *age-ăbdúce* Stich. 418.

Here, too, the shortening of a vowel naturally long is so rare as to excite suspicion. The most clearly attested shortenings are of ē (*ĕx*, *ĕc*-) and ā (*ăb*), e.g. *tibi-ĕuĕnit* (Merc. 774; cf. *béne-ĕueníse* Poen. 1078), *quid ă nóbis metuit?* Capt. 206.

For other examples see Skutsch in *Satura Viadrina*, Breslau 1896. For statistics of the scansion of trisyllabic words like *voluptas*, *molestae* &c., see Esch (mentioned above). The 'brevis brevians' need not be a monosyllable (naturally or by elision); cf. *ipsus ĭllic* Mil. 1388, *inter ĭstas* Poen. 265. (For other examples see Skutsch, *Forschungen*, i. p. 98.) Priscian's citation (i. p. 17, 2) of *sine ĭnuidia* (Ter. *Andr.* 66) as an example of the suppression of *v*, like the loss of the Greek Digamma, must not be construed into a theory of this scansion. He is merely seeking a parallel from Latin poetry which will illustrate to Roman students of Homer how a vowel followed by a consonant and *v* might be capable of short scansion.

Other polysyllabic groups have more resemblance to iambic words:—

22. (4) Monosyllabic words joined in utterance into a word-group with a single accent. A phrase like *quis huc currit?* would have the accentuation of a phrase consisting of an iambic word followed by *currit* (see Appendix), *quís-huc-cúrrit* like *míser cúrrit*. Whether the accent on the first monosyllable or the accent on the longer word would be the more forcible depended on the nature and nuance of the phrase. In such word-groups a long (even long by nature) monosyllabic subordinate or enclitic word, e.g. *huc*, *haec*, is frequently shortened under the Law of Breves Breviantes, e.g. *quís hŭc cúrrit?*[1], *quís haĕc díxit?*, *quod hĭc t(e) órat* Poen. 1024, *ut haĕc ínueniántur* Poen. 1171.

Sometimes the short preceding syllable is composed not of a monosyllabic word but of an elided disyllable, e.g. *Bacch.* 491 *tib(i)*. Sometimes the subordinate word is an elided disyllable, e.g. *hercl(e)*, *Aul.* 831 *uel hĕrcle énica*. Sometimes the word-group is as capable of being classed with the instances given in § 21, e.g. *éripe ĕx-ore* Stich. 718. (Other examples in Skutsch, *Forschungen*, i. p. 98 *n.*)

23. The requirements for the shortening of a syllable in Plautus are therefore (1) a preceding short syllable, (2) accent on a neighbouring syllable, whether on the following or on the (short) preceding. Are these requirements ever dispensed with?

Certainly a syllable which bore the accent[2] in the pronunciation

[1] The Roman Grammarians tell us that the Interrogative Pronoun was accented, the Relative unaccented. (*Lat. Lang.* ch. iii. § 12 *a*.)

[2] We must distinguish between word-accent, i.e. the accent which a word would have if it were mentioned alone, and 'sentence-accent,' i.e. the accent

of the sentence is never shortened. *Philĭppus*, the name of the coin, was, as we have seen (§ 11), accented on the first syllable in imitation of the Greek. The Adverb *perinde* (with *proinde*, *deinde*) was accented on the first syllable, as we are told by the Latin Grammarians (Priscian xv. 9, p. 67; cf. Serv. *ad Aen.* vi. 743), which accounts for the scansion *perĭnde* in *Stich.* 520 *Út cuique homini rés parata est périnde amicis útitur* (A, Charisius); cf. *Phorm.* 668, and see other examples in Esch, p. 43. The scansion *sagĭtta* (apparently a loan-word) may be accounted for in the same way. It is the scansion of the word in its three occurrences in Plautus, *Pers.* 25, *Aul.* 395, *Trin.* 725.

So with *satĕllites* of *Trin.* 833: *Distráxissent disqué tulissent satellítes tui me miserúm foede* (AP) (Anap.), another loan-word. Some however explain the shortening by the accentuation of the word-group *satellités-tui*, and apply the same explanation to *simĭllumaé-sunt* of *Asin.* 241: *Pórtitorum símillumae sunt iánuae lenóniae* (for another suggestion regarding the scansion of this line see *Class. Rev.* vi. 342). The scansion *dedĭstine* Trin. 129: *Dedistíne hoc facto ei gládium, qui se occideret?* (MSS. = P) is the result of the accentuation *dedistíne*. In *Curc.* 345 *dedistín tu?* or *dedisti-tu?* (so the MSS.) is scanned *dedĭsti(n) tu.* Whether *dedĭsse dono hodie* of *Amph.* 761 is rightly explained by the accentuation of the word-group *dedisse-dóno* is uncertain (cf. *Men.* 689 *dédĭsti eam donó mihi*; Epid. 474 *tĭb(i) ăddam-dóno*, the probable scansion). The accentuation *senectún* explains the scansion *senĕctan* Cas. 240: *Sénectan aetate únguentatus pér uias, ignáue, incedis?* (*senecta* MSS. = P, which would leave hiatus. In *Most.* 217 the scansion is probably *senĕcta*, but whether *tibist* should be read with Klotz *Grundzüge* p. 92 or *in* omitted is doubtful). *Profecto*, usually a bacchius, is occasionally scanned as an anapaest, e.g. *Poen.* 907 *Próféćto ad incitás lenonem rédiget si eas abdúxerit* (AP, Nonius). (Other exx. in Esch, pp. 39 sq.) Had it, like *perinde*, the accent on the first syllable? Should *fenĕstra* (Mil. 379 &c.), the invariable scansion in Plautus, be changed to *festra* (Paul. Fest. 64. 33 Th. 'festram' antiqui dicebant quam nos 'fenestram'), or is the shorter form itself to be explained by an accentuation *fénestra*?

24. And other apparent extensions of the Law probably either depend on niceties of Latin Accentuation which cannot be formulated by us with certainty, or are corrupt readings.

Here are the most notable instances:—*Philŏxene* Bacch. 1106: *A.* Philoxéne, salue. *B.* Et tu. Unde ágis? *A.* Unde homo miser átque infortunátus (is the metre rightly supposed to be anapaestic?); *quiĕsce*(?) Merc. 447: *A.* Quíesce, inquam. | Istánc rem ego recte uídero. *B.* Quid aís? *A.* Quid est? (MSS. = P) (rather scan *quiēsce*, § 15); in *Cas.* 496 Quibus battuatur tibi ŏs, senex nequissume (MSS. = P), the shortening of the emphatic word *os* is without a parallel (*ós tibi* Mueller; cf. § 15); *quid ĕxprobras* Trin. 318: Quid exprobras? bene quód

which it would receive in its sentence. The word *voluptas* standing alone was accented *volúptas*, but in the phrase *voluptas mea* 'my darling,' the accentuation was *voluptás-mea* (see above, § 21). Cf. Gk. πρὸς but πρὸς πόλιν (see Appendix).

fecisti, tíbi fecisti, nón mihi (AP); *per hŏrtum transibo* Stich. 614: Nón metuo: per hortúm transibo, nón prodibo in públicum (AP); *ubi ăccubes* Stich. 618: *A*. Úbi accubes. *B*. Sané faciundum cénseo. *A*. O lux óppidi (AP); *sed ŏptume* Merc. 329: Nunc ádeo ibo illuc. Séd optume gnatúm meum ‖ Video éccum &c. (MSS. = P); *Pers*. 543: *A*. Mércimonium. *B*. Aéqua dicis. Séd optume eccum ipse áduenit (A; cf. P); *sed ŭxor* Rud. 895: Sed uxór scelesta me ómnibus seruát modis (MSS. = P); *Cas*. 227 Ut illí placeam; et placeo, út uideor. Sed uxór me excruciat, quía uiuit (MSS. = P).

25. But there is one case of shortening which does not quite seem to conform with the conditions mentioned above (§ 23). I mean the shortening of the final syllable of Cretic words and word-endings, a shortening of which we find traces even in Horace, e.g. *Polliŏ* (*C*. ii. 1. 14), *dixerŏ* (*S*. i. 4. 104) (see above § 18), and in all poets in the word *nesciŏquis*. Here we have the one condition observed, viz. that a short syllable shall precede the shortened syllable, but apparently not the other. viz. that the accent which operates in the shortening shall fall on the neighbouring syllable. The accent which operates in the shortening of the final syllable of *Polliŏ* is apparently the accent on the syllable *Pol-*. It may indeed be said that in a phrase like *díxero uérbum* the accent on the syllable *ver-*, the neighbouring syllable in the word-group *díxerŏ-uérbum*, is the operating factor. But it is questionable whether the Cretic words which exhibit this reduction in Plautus are so definitely members of word-groups as the Iambic words which exhibit it, e.g. *dabo* (*dabŏ-plágam*, &c.; above, § 19). Perhaps it is truer to regard as a factor in the shortening the tendency of every final syllable in Latin to be weakly articulated, and the tendency of a final vowel to be shortened before an initial vowel (§ 38). In Plautus a shortening of this kind in Iambic and Trochaic verse can be looked for only in the first foot of the line or hemistich, since a collocation of syllables like ⏑́ ⏑ ⏑, ⏑́ is excluded (iii. § 7). Instances in these metres are not frequent, e.g. *Rud*. 944 *A*. *Enícăs* iam me odio, quísquis es. *B*. Non sínam ego abire hinc té. Mane; *Capt*. 408 Núnquam erit tam auárus quin te ‖ *grátiĭs* emittát manu. (Similarly *sequimini* is a proceleusmatic in *Cas*. 165 *Sequimínĭ*: fortasse te illum mirari coquum.) But they abound in Anapaestic lines, e.g. *gratiăs* Trin. 821, *turbinĕs* Trin. 835, *maritumĭs* Cist. 211, Cas. 165 *Sequimínĭ* comites in próxumum me huc, &c. (For a fuller list see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 59.) And this is apparently the true scansion in Anapaestic Cantica of words formerly scanned with Synizesis, e.g. *gaudio*, *aureo* (§ 15).

Nŏn-enim is always a dactyl, never a cretic, in dialogue metres. Cf. Ennius *Ann*. 287 M.:

non enĭm rumores ponebăt ante salutem.

26. For the shortening of a syllable, whether in these Cretic words or in the others, it is necessary that the preceding syllable be really short[1], e.g. *pătī*, *perpĕtī*. The intervention of a Mute and Liquid, though never lengthening a vowel by 'position' in Plautus (e.g. never *pātri*, § 30), yet seems to have debarred it from acting as a 'Brevis Brevians.' The examples of shortenings like *patrĭ*, *perpetrŏ* (for a full list of conceivable instances see Peters in *Harvard Studies*, ix. 115) are so rare that they are in all likelihood illusory. For *quadrĭngentos* (e.g. Rud. 1324) we should probably read *quadrĭgentos*, the older form (*Lat. Lang.* vi. § 77; denied by Skutsch in *Deutsche Litteraturzeitung* 1895, p. 1294).

27. The intervention of *qu* seems to have operated, though not so decidedly, in the same direction. While shortenings of the type *locĭ* are freely admitted, shortenings of the type *loquĭ* are not very frequent. The combination *-quo-* appears to have interfered least with the shortening. At any rate, *loquŏr* (e.g. Cas. 166), *sequŏr* are so frequent that they cannot be questioned, which can hardly be said of *loquăr*, *sequăr* (e.g. Cist. 698 *persequăr*), *loquĭ*, *sequĭ*.

28. On the other hand a long final syllable (or syllable ending in *m*) shortened in hiatus (below, § 40) is a perfectly acceptable 'Brevis Brevians,' e.g. *sĭ ĕffexis hoc* (Cas. 709).

And the addition of *-que*, *-ne* does not make the shortening impossible, if these Enclitics are elided (§ 29[a]), e.g. *prosperĕqu(e)* Amph. 463 (cf. Pseud. 574), *gregĭqu(e) huíc* Asin. 3, *vidĕn* (§ 16).

29. It is commonly said that no syllable under the ictus can exhibit this shortening (Seyffert in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschr.*, 1891, p. 77), so that in a line like *Truc.* 698 (Iamb. Senar.):

ubi male accipiar méa mihi pecúnia,

we must scan *ubí male ăccípiar*, with *ubi* Iambus, and not *ubĭ male accípiar*, with the first foot a tribrach; and in Liv. Andr. *Trag.* 38 R. (Iamb. Senar.):

quem ego nefrendem alui lácteam immulgéns opem,

editors resort to the extremely doubtful scansion *nĕfrendem* in order to avoid *quem egŏ nĕ-*. But to ascribe to the mere incidence of the ictus or beat of the line any influence over the quantity of a syllable

[1] The *s* (*ss*) that stood for Gk. ζ necessarily lengthened a syllable, so that 'semīsŏnarii' (from Gk. ζώνη) of *Aul.* 516 (*semul sonarii* Leo) is impossible.

is surely unreasonable. The scansion of a Latin line was determined by the Latin pronunciation of a sentence, not by a music-conductor's indication of the 'time'. This theory that the shortening of syllables through the Breves Breviantes Law was due to ictus has led many of its supporters to the strange idea that Plautus allowed a Trochaic Septenarius (*Stich.* 700, quoted in § 17) to begin with the word *amica*, scanned as a tribrach. The incidence of the ictus on the first syllable of the line, they say, caused the word to sound (in this particular line) *amĭca* instead of *amīca*. But if (as they allow) the word was invariably pronounced *amīca* by a Roman, how could the mere wielding of a conductor's baton legitimize a mispronunciation like *amĭca*? This extreme form of the theory, which seems hardly worth discussing, has been already noticed in § 17. Here we have to consider a more plausible hypothesis, which ascribes to the ictus a negative, rather than a positive, voice in the scansion of a line. In the case of certain syllables which in ordinary pronunciation were deprived of their full 'long' quantity and on occasion assumed or came near to assuming the 'short' quantity, the ictus of the line, it is supposed, might interfere to prevent the syllable from playing this assumed part. The words *ubi male accipiar* were so pronounced by Roman lips that the true iambic sound of *ubi* was obscured and the word fell on the ear almost like a pyrrich. A poet had thus the option of treating the word as a pyrrich, when it pleased him to do so, instead of as an iambus. According to this hypothesis, he would abstain from availing himself of this licence in certain circumstances. He would, for example, have no hesitation in beginning a trochaic line with the tribrach *úbĭ măl-*, but would avoid, as inharmonious, the same tribrach-opening of an iambic line *ŭbĭ mál-*.

Even this modified form of the theory seems to me to ascribe a potency to the ictus in Latin verse which it could only have in the sing-song repetition of Roman school-children. Plautus scanned the words *ubi male accipiar* as he pronounced them. If his pronunciation of *ubi* in this context varied on occasion between *ubĭ* and *ubī*, or was consistently half-way between the two scansions, he admitted the one or the other according to metrical exigencies. In this case the metre tolerates both *ubĭ* and *ubī*, and the only consideration that would determine his metrical treatment of the word would be his notorious predilection for an identity of ictus and accent (see Appendix). If we can prove that the rhythm *ubĭ male accipiar* more exactly reproduced the intonation of these words in ordinary discourse than *ubī male áccipiar*, then we have all the justification we need for believing the first foot of the line to be a tribrach. The dialogue metres usually leave us without definite indication of the quantity in such cases; and we cannot appeal to the other metres used by Plautus, for in

Anapaestic metre a collocation like ,⏑́⏑, is not favoured (iii. § 21), and Bacchiac and Cretic hardly allow the operation of the Breves Breviantes Law (§ 34ᵃ). The scarcity of clear instances of the ictus *ubĭ* &c. may be accounted for by the nature of the metres of Plautus, and is also, no doubt, a consequence of the close correspondence of ictus and accent in his verses. *Adhuc* (accented on the final) is never under any circumstances a pyrrich.

(On the short scansion of *-ŭs*, *-ĭs* before a consonant, even when the ictus falls on these syllables, e.g. *satĭs male accípiar*, see § 3; and on the mistaken theory of *´ubi* as necessarily *ubī* and not *ubĭ* &c., see iii. § 9.)

29ᵃ. It is not true that this shortening is forbidden in the 2nd or 4th syllable of a proceleusmatic which has the ictus on the first syllable. We have, for example, *tibĭ* in the proceleusmatic *tíbĭ plăcĭ-* Merc. 965: *Úxor tibi placida ét placatast. Cétte dextras núnciam.* (The other examples, which are not many, are collected by Skutsch in *Satura Viadrina.*) Even two shortenings in the same proceleusmatic (with ictus on first or third syllable) seem to be tolerated, e.g. *egŏ quidĕm* in *Epid.* 202: *A.* Ét ego Apoecidés sum. *B.* Et ego quidem sum Épidicus. Sed, ere, óptuma; *darĭ pótĕst* in Merc. 778: *A.* Dari pótest interea dum illi ponunt. *B.* Quin abis (AP). (Cf. *Curc.* 311, *Asin.* 147, &c. 'Wait a bit' was in Latin *mánĕ manĕ*, e.g. *Aul.* 655; see App. § 9.) The shortening is also tolerated in a dactyl which forms the fourth foot of a Trochaic Septenarius (iii. § 17), e.g. *patĕr* in *Trin.* 316: Neú tibi aegritúdinem, pater, párerem parsi sédulo; *ubĭ* in *Capt.* 559: Crédidi esse insánum extemplo ubi té appellauit Týndarum; *in hŏc* in *Pers.* 37: Quós continuo tíbi reponam in hoc tríduo aut quadríduo. (For other examples see Skutsch in *Satura Viadrina.*)

It is not true to say (with Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 56) that this shortening is avoided in the even feet of Iambic, and the odd feet of Trochaic lines. We have numerous instances to the contrary, e.g. *domĭ* in *Capt.* 21: Hic núnc domi seruit suó patri nec scit pater; *abĭ* in *Capt.* 870: *A.* Núnc tu mihi placés. *B.* Abi, stultu's, séro post tempús uenis. (For other examples see Podiaski, *Troch. Sept. Ter.* p. 22; Manning in *Harvard Studies*, ix.) But it seems to be avoided in the thesis of the seventh foot of an Iambic Septenarius[1] (and Octonarius).

Klotz's theory (*Grundzüge*, p. 82) that retrogression of the accent following on elision, e.g. *mólest(ae)*, *ámic(a)*, legitimizes a scansion like *molĕst(ae) hae sunt* (as he proposes to read for *molĕstae-sunt* in *Mil.* 69), *amĭc(a) uter utrubi* &c. (§ 17), is most unlikely. We have no reason for thinking that when any final syllable whatever was elided the accent went a syllable nearer the beginning of the word (see Appendix), but only when an enclitic appendix like *-que* was elided, e.g. *próspereq(ue)* (§ 28). So *plerique*, but the word-group *plĕriq(ue) -ómnes* (*Amer. Journ. Phil.* xiv. 169).

[1] Terence's Septenarius-endings: *quin egŏ maneo* Haut. 737, *tuom tibĭ reddo* Haut. 742, *et mihĭ prósit* Hec. 798 are not exceptions, for *tibi*, *mihi*, as well as *ego*, were by his time rather pyrrich than iambic words. *Poen.* 1198 *ingénium patris habĕt quód sapit*, a Dimeter, shews this shortening.

D. Other Peculiarities.

30. (9) **Mute and Liquid.** When a vowel naturally short precedes a Mute and Liquid, the syllable is never lengthened by 'position' by the Republican Dramatists as it is in other poetry. While Ennius in his Epic and Lucilius in his Satires allow themselves such scansions as *nīgrum, fēbris, fībras, trīclini*, the Dramatists recognize only *nĭgrum, trĭclini*, &c. The syllables were apparently short in the ordinary every-day utterance of their time, just as in Greek[1]; so that *nĭgrum, fĕbris*, &c. represent the colloquial pronunciation, while *nīgrum, fēbris* belong to the artificial language of poetry. That this distinction holds even for the fourth century A.D.[2] we see from the remark of Servius on *perăgro* in Virg. *Aen.* i. 384: 'per-' habet accentum...Muta enim et liquida quotiens ponuntur metrum iuvant, non accentum.

On *rūbrica* (Truc. 294) see § 5. What Sisenna refers to when he says of a passage (in the *Rudens*?) of Plautus: 'latronem' producit metri causa (Rufinus, *Comm. in Metra Terent.* p. 561 K.) is not clear.

31. Very suspicious is the scansion *ĭmmŏ* (Merc. 737, Cist. 565, Hec. 877, 437, 726, Phorm. 936, Caecilius 128 R.). The old theory that the first syllables of *omnis* (Birt in *Rheinisches Museum*, li. p. 240), *inter*, *ille* were 'half-long' and might be scanned on occasion as short by the Dramatists should be abandoned. All the sure instances of *ŏmnis*, *ĭnter*, *ĭllos*, etc. are found to come under the Law of Breves Breviantes, &c. (e.g. *Mil.* 55), while *ill(e)* (§ 14), not '*ĭlle*,' is the true pronunciation in lines like *Capt.* 105.

32. A few other points of Plautine Prosody may be treated here:—

In the Dat. Abl. Plur. of *io*-stems Plautus and Terence use only the full form *-iis*. Similarly in the Adverbs (originally Ablatives Plural) *gratiis* (cf. § 15), *ingratiis*.

Flagitis is ascribed to Turpilius (162 R.), a poet of c. 115 B.C. (*al.* flagiti). Details of the scansion of Compounds of *iacio* (e.g. *abjecio*, *ăbicio*) are given by Mather in *Harvard Studies* vi.

In the Third Person Plural of the Perfect Indicative *-ērunt* is more favoured than *-ĕrunt* by the Dramatists; they use the latter form only through metrical exigencies, at the end of the line or hemistich

[1] In the Greek Drama the lengthening by 'position' of such syllables is more a feature of Tragedy than Comedy. In the New Comedy even the heavier combinations of Mute and Liquid do not necessitate long scansion (Perschinka in *Dissert. Philol. Vindobonenses*, iii. 368).

[2] Still in Vulgar Latin, whether in consequence of the mispronunciation with parasitic vowel between the mute and liquid, or from some other cause, the combination seems to have produced length by position and to have attracted the accent. The Romance languages (e.g. Span. tiniéblas) point to *tenébrae*, &c., as the Vulgar Latin pronunciation (*Lat. Lang.* iii. § 11).

(but cf. *Poen.* prol. 21). It is in this part of the line that all forms and scansions that are little used, whether on account of antiquity or of novelty, are to be looked for, e.g. *dănunt* for *dant*, e.g. Caecil. 176 R. patiére quod dant, quándo optata nón danunt; *noverim*, *-averim*, *novero*, *-avero*, &c. for *norim*, *-arim*, *noro*, *-aro* (the forms without *v* are the almost invariable forms in Terence, but Plautus uses the older forms too). *Neutiquam* (rather *ne utiquam*, for Donatus calls it a word-group, 'una pars orationis') is scanned by the Dramatists with the first syllable short. *Dīrectus* seems a quadrisyllable (Sonnenschein on *Rud.* 1170) with *dīr-* a spondee. *Schēma*, *-ae*, is the form used in Latin Comedy. *Hĭc*, *illĭc*, *istĭc* Nom. Sing.; *hīc* Adv.; *illīc*, *istīc* Adv. or Dat. Sing.; *hōc*, *hūc*, *illūc*, *istūc*, Neut. or Adv. There is no certain example of *hīc* Nom. Sing. even in the late Republican Dramatists (see Seyffert in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* xviii. 977); cf. § 5. On *periculum* (at end of line, etc.) beside *periclum* (normal) see § 4.

Interjections, the Roman Grammarians tell us, have no 'certi accentus.' For details of Plautus' scansions, e.g. *attăt*, *attătae*, *ĕhem* (ĕ-?), *ĕheu*, *ŏhŏ* (-ŏ?), *ei*, *eugae*, *eugĕpae*, *heiă* (-ă?), *hui*, *ŏhĕ* (-ĕ?), see Richter in Studemund's *Studien* i. pp. 387 sqq. *St* has the worth of a long syllable (Hauler on *Phorm.* 743).

33. A short final syllable is capable of scansion as long (Syllaba Anceps):

(1) at a change of speaker, or at any marked pause in the line (see §§ 42 sqq.), e.g.

Cas. 738 Seruús sum tuús. Optumést. Obsecró te (bacch.).

(Other examples in Klotz *Grundzüge*, p. 111.)

(2) at the Diaeresis[1], e.g.

Rud. 390 qui súos parentes *nóscerē* possét: eam uerétur (iamb.),
Rud. 234 cérto uox *múliebrīs* aúris tetigít meas (cret.),
Truc. 463 uosmét iam *uidḗtīs*, ut órnata incédo (bacch.).

34. Lengthening 'in arsi' is characteristic of Dactylic Poetry (cf. Luc. Mueller *Res Metr.*[2] p. 393) and can hardly be ascribed to the Dramatists. But we meet with a few cases of the long scansion of a short final syllable which are not always easy to explain. Before the final 'metrum' of an Iambic line (or the corresponding part of a Trochaic Septenarius) we have, e.g.:

Asin. 250 átque argento cómparando *fíngerē* falláciam.
Poen. 84 altéra quinquennis, *álterā* quadrímula.
Curc. 438 quia núdius quartus *uénimūs* in Cáriam.
Epid. 498 potuít: plus iam sum *liberā* quinquénnium.
Titinius 45 R. Párasitos amóui, lenonem *aédibūs* abstérrui.

[1] In Trochaic Verse Syllaba Anceps at the Diaeresis is, of course, unrecognizable. For a fuller list of examples of Syllaba Anceps at the Diaeresis, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, 142—182.

[redacted]

For other examples see C. F. Müller, *Plautinische Prosodie*. On *vĕnibit*, Men. 1160, see § 44 fin. Before initial *sc-*, *sp-*, etc. we have no certain example (cf. *Pseud.* 1008) of a short final vowel lengthened by position: cf. Acc. *Trag.* 68 R. *clauserĭ specis*.

34ᵃ. Ritschl's theory that stricter laws of Prosody were observed in some metres than in others can hardly stand. It is true that in Cretic and Bacchiac passages the Law of Breves Breviantes has very limited operation, mainly because the nature of these metres was adapted for iambus-words rather than pyrrich-words (iii. §§ 27–8, 36); and in Anapaestic lines the scansion of a Cretic word as a Dactyl under this law is as common as it is rare in the dialogue metres, whose nature was not adapted for dactyl-words (iii. § 7). But apart from these peculiarities of technique and apart from the necessary divergence of the style and vocabulary of lyric passages from those of the ordinary dialogue-portions, there is nothing to warrant the distinction of 'zahme' and 'wilde Rhythmen' in Plautus. (See Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 17.)

E. Hiatus.

35. Cicero, speaking of the earlier Roman poets, says (*Orator* xlv. 152): Sed Graeci viderint; nobis, ne si cupiamus quidem, distrahere voces conceditur. indicant orationes illae ipsae horridulae Catonis, indicant omnes poetae praeter eos, qui, ut versum facerent, saepe hiabant, ut Naevius:

> uos, quí | accolitis Hístrum fluuium atque álgidam,

et ibidem:

> quam númquam uobis Graíi | atque bárbari,

at Ennius semel (*al.* saepe): 'Scipio | inuicte,' et quidem nos: 'hoc motu radiantis Etesiae | in vada ponti.' hoc idem nostri saepius non tulissent, quod Graeci laudare etiam solent.

It has been suggested that the loss of *-d* from the termination of Ablatives Singular would leave an appearance of hiatus, a false appearance, to a critic of Cicero's time, just as the disuse of the Digamma gave Alexandrian critics a wrong impression of Homer's tolerance of hiatus. No doubt a line like the Saturnian of Naevius:

> noctu Troiad exibant capitibus opertis,

would, if written with the current form *Troia*, instead of the form actually used by Naevius, give the impression that Naevius had left an hiatus between *Troia* and *exibant*; and it is conceivable that Cicero's verdict is in some part based on a misapprehension of this kind. But it is impossible to explain it all away in this fashion. The instances which Cicero quotes are not instances of Ablative forms followed by seeming hiatus. And Abl. forms with final *d* would be found only in the earliest poetry, the poetry of Livius and

Naevius, and probably only in their non-dramatic writings. To Plautus, in whose time the final *d* after a long vowel (except in *med*, *ted*, § 5) seems to have been as definitely dropped in pronunciation as our final *b* in 'lamb,' the use of such a form in his lines which were reproductions of the language of every-day life was impossible. Cicero's statement must be accepted as an expression of the opinion of competent criticism in the last century of the Republic, that hiatus was a feature of early, in contrast to contemporary, poetry.

36. Now this opinion is one that cannot be arbitrarily put aside. Ritschl's attempt to restrict hiatus in Plautus within the narrow limits to which Terence seems to confine it (see Leo *Plaut. Forsch.* 3), involves too much tampering with the MSS. (cf. Klotz *Grundzüge*, p. 14). Why should we accept the evidence of the MSS. for line after line and reject it as soon as an hiatus appears?

One answer to this question has recently been given which would throw discouragement on our efforts to discover Plautus' usage in regard to hiatus. It is said[1] that the earliest edition of the works of Plautus was made at that archaizing period in the Early Empire, when the belief that each and every form of hiatus was tolerated in the archaic poetry shewed itself in the verses written in imitation of the early style[2]. And it is argued that the editors, while they would use the resources then available to them, but now lost to us, in remedying other defects of the lines, would make no attempt to remedy a line which suffered from hiatus. They would not recognize hiatus as a defect. So when our MSS. (AP^A) agree in exhibiting a line with hiatus, we should not, it is urged, believe that this is the form in which Plautus wrote the line, but we should accept it as a corrupt form, which might have been emended by the ancient editors with the help of the materials at their command, but which we at this late period can hardly hope to emend.

This theory, it appears to me, may, like its neighbour-theory of the close connexion of our two earliest MSS., A and P^A (above,

[1] Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, ch. i. His views are criticized by Seyffert in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1896, pp. 234, 264, by Redslob in *Literarisches Centralblatt*, 1895, p. 1761, and by others. Leo in his edition of Plautus leaves as a rule unemended all lines whose only defect is Hiatus, even those for which we have only the evidence of P, a single mediaeval MS. (i. § 3). Since mediaeval scribes erred as often in omitting a syllable or word as in inserting one, the number of lines of this kind is naturally very considerable, and quite disfigures Leo's text. The subsequent discovery of the readings of T has here and there supplied the omission.

[2] The acrostic Arguments of the plays of Plautus favour Hiatus. See my note on the Argument of the *Captivi*.

ch. i. § 18), be disproved by an examination of the facts. If we find that the instances of hiatus on which our MSS. agree, admit of being grouped round one or two types, and that these types of hiatus have in themselves an intrinsic probability, then we shall have grounds for ascribing the hiatus to Plautus himself. Of course the two ancient recensions which these MSS. represent may from the first have shared in a certain number, probably a very limited number (i. § 18), of corrupt readings which left a false hiatus in this or that line; while other corruptions (especially the 'modernization' of unfamiliar forms like *illĭc* Nom., *illīc* Dat., *illunc*, *horunc*, *ipsus*, *med*, *ted*, *ŭti*) may have found their way at different periods into the one text and the other with the same result. But while all this makes the discovery of Plautus' actual rules of Hiatus a difficult task, it does not by any means make it impossible.

That Latin *h* had at some early (probably very early) period a stronger sound (cf. dialectal *fostis* for *hostis*, like our dialectal '*thof*' for '*though*') than it had in classical Latin is certain. I can however see no reason for believing it to have retained this in Plautus' time (cf. § 15), and cannot accept the theory that initial *h* may disqualify elision in Plautine verse. (Birt in *Rheinisches Museum*, liv. 40, gives a full list of available passages.) Plautus left hiatus in, e.g., 'qui amat' as readily as in, e.g., 'qui habet.'

37. Under what circumstances then do we find Hiatus in the lines of Plautus, so strongly supported by the evidence of MSS. and by analogy from other Latin poetry or by 'à priori' considerations, as to seem worthy of our acceptance?

For a full list of examples of Hiatus in Early Poetry see Maurenbrecher *Hiatus und Verschleifung im alten Latein*, Leipzig, 1899. The author goes to the other extreme from Ritschl and accepts many apparent examples for which the manuscript evidence is not sufficiently free from doubt. He adopts also what seems to me a mistaken principle, and pays regard to the nature of the ending (*-m*, *-ā*, *-ē*, etc.) of the words rather than to the intonation of the clause in which they stand. There is no evidence that one long vowel was treated differently from another in respect of hiatus or that a final syllable in *-m* was not in this respect precisely on a par with a final long vowel—any long vowel.

(I) **Metrical Hiatus**, at the end of the first hemistich of long lines,—Iambic, Trochaic and Anapaestic Septenarii and Octonarii, Cretic and Bacchiac Tetrameters, &c., e.g. :—

Rud. 388 Sed quíd flet? Ego dicám tibi : | hoc sése excruciat ánimi (Iamb. Sept.),

Amph. 208 redúcturum, abiturós agro | Argívos, pacem atque ótium (Iamb. Oct.),

Curc. 567 príŭsquam te huic meaé machaerae | óbicio, mastígia (Troch. Sept.),

Bacch. 612 pétulans, prōteruo, íracundo | ánimo, indomito, incógitato (Troch. Oct.),

Mil. 1055 expróme benignum ex te íngenium, | urbícape, occisor régum (Anap. Sept.),

Cas. 188 néc mihi iús meum | óbtinendi óptiost (Cret. Tetram.),

Men. 968 ut ábsente eró rem | erí diligénter (Bacch. Tetram.).

(For a fuller list of examples see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 142 sqq. Syllaba Anceps is found at the same place; see above, § 33.) This is not real Hiatus of the kind referred to by Cicero. All that these scansions imply is that to Plautus these long lines were as much pairs of short lines as anything else, and that, e.g., *Rud.* 388 might be written:

Sed quid flet? Ego dicam tibi:
hoc sese excruciat animi,

just as we may write:

Of all the days that's in the week
I dearly love but one day;
And that's the day that comes between
The Saturday and Monday,

as four short or as two long lines.

Ritschl, however, in his opposition to the lax theory of previous editors, that Hiatus was admissible in any circumstances whatever in Plautus, set his face against even this Metrical Hiatus, so far as he could. His views were for a time accepted by his pupils, the editors of the large Teubner edition, so that in their earlier volumes the text has been systematically altered in avoidance of a supposed illegitimate hiatus of this kind. In the small Teubner edition these alterations have been discarded. Some details regarding the extent to which two closely connected words are allowed this Metrical Hiatus, e.g. *molesta‖es*, will be found in Brock, *Quaest. Gramm.* 172.

Klotz (*Grundzüge*, pp. 165 sqq., 208 sq.), although he rightly denies the possibility of Plautus allowing hiatus at the mere caesura of an Iambic Senarius, thinks that ancient editors of Plautus allowed it, and that lines like *Aul.* 399:

congrum, muraenam | exossata fac sient (*v.l.* c. m. exdorsua, quantum potest),

are 'doctored' lines, of which he finds some 70 or 80 examples in Plautus. Seyffert (*Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1891, pp. 878 sqq.) has succeeded in throwing strong doubt on this theory.

38. (2) **Prosodic Hiatus,** by which a final long vowel or syllable ending in *-m* is neither elided nor wholly unaffected before

[redacted]

an initial vowel, but is scanned as a short syllable. That this treatment was a natural tendency of the language we see from words like *prĕhendo* for *prae-hendo*, *cŏmest*, *comitium* (but *coetus*), *circŭit* (but *circitor*, with elision) for *circum-it*. A short vowel is elided, e.g. *suaveolens* pronounced *suav'olens*, *antehac* pronounced *ant'hac*[1].

Instances of Hiatus and of Elision in Compounds or Word-groups are: *intrŏibis* Bacch. 907, *intr(o) ibo* Pers. 77, &c., *intrŏierit* Trin. prol. 10, *circŭmirier* Curc. 451, *circŭmis* Rud. 140, *circ(um)itione* Andr. 202, *dom(um)-itionem* (spelled *domuitionem* Pacuvius 172 R.; for the pronunciation cf. Rhetor. ad Herenn. iii. 21. 34). With the hiatus in *flagĭtiŭm-hŏminis* (the normal ictus and apparently accentuation) compare *manŭ-emitto* (Curc. 497). We find elision in *anim(um)-adverto*.

39. So meagre and uncertain are our remains of Saturnian Verse that it seems impossible to formulate with certainty the precise laws of the metre, and it is dangerous to quote from them precedents for any practice in Latin versification[2]. Still the patent regard in that early metre for the number of syllables in the line entitles one to say that it is at least probable that (1) a long final vowel, (2) a final syllable ending in *-m*, were allowed in Saturnian Verse to stand in this kind of Hiatus before an initial vowel, as a short final vowel would not be allowed, e.g. *patrem suum supremum optumum* | *appellat*, like *dabunt malum Metelli Naevio poetae*. (For details see *Amer. Journ. Philol.* xiv. 309.)

In other branches of Latin poetry we find the same practice, e.g.

Virg. *Ecl.* viii. 108 credimus? an *quĭ* ămant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?

Catull. xcvii. 1 non (ita me *dĭ* ăment) quicquam referre putavi.

These two scansions are not artificial scansions. They reflect the actual pronunciation of these phrases in everyday life. In Plautus *qui* is similarly treated in the phrases *qui amat, qui amant, qui habet, qui habent*, &c. (for instances, see *Journ. Phil.* xxvi. 296), and the adjuration has the metrical form *ita me dĭ ament* normally (for instances, see Hauler's note on Ter. *Phorm.* 165).

Virg. *Aen.* vi. 507 *tĕ*, ămice, nequivi; Hor. *S.* I. ix. 38 si *mĕ* ămas; *S.* II. ii. 28 cocto *nŭm* ădest honor idem?; Lucret. ii.

[1] If Horace wrote *malĕ ominatis* and not *male nominatis* (δυσώνυμοις), it must have been a reminiscence from earlier poetry when *malĕ* was still the pronunciation (above, § 16).

[2] As Klotz has attempted to do in his *Grundzüge*, using the old-fashioned 'quantitative' theory of the Saturnian Metre.

681 *cŭm* ŏdore; Lucil. xxx. 24 M. *quŏ* ĕam; i. 32 *quăm* hŏmo, &c.

The restriction seems to be that the shortened but unelided syllable shall be united with another short syllable in the same arsis or thesis, as we find also in these (rarer) examples of iambus-words:

Virg. *Ecl.* iii. 79 et longe 'formose, vale, *vălĕ*,' inquit, 'Iolla' (cf. Ovid *Met.* iii. 501 'vale *vălĕ*,' inquit).

Ovid *Am.* II. xiii. 21 lenis ades precibusque meis *făvĕ*, Ilithyia.

Elision of iambus-words is avoided by the Classical poets. (For details see Mueller *Res Metr.*[2] p. 340.) Cf. Ennius *Ann.* 320 M. *dum quĭdĕm unus homo.*

40. And this is the common type of the Plautine instances too. The words which exhibit Hiatus are usually words (far more often monosyllables than iambus-words) on which a certain stress would be laid in pronunciation, e.g.

Cas. 724 Bone uír, salue. Fateór. Quid fit? *Tŭ* amás: *egŏ* esurio ét sitio (Anap.).

Men. 115 *quŏ* ego eam, quám rem agam, quíd negotí geram (Cret.).

(Interrogatives had a strong stress in a Latin sentence; see Appendix.)

Merc. 479 *Túăm* amicam. Nímium multum scís. Tuis ingrátiis (*AP*).

Amph. 622 nón soleo ego somnículose *ĕrĭ* imperia pérsequi (*P*, *A n. l.*).

Stich. 152 sí quae forte ex Asia nauis *hĕrĭ* aut hodie uénerit (*AP*).

Pseud. 319 úna opera alligém fugitiuam *cánĕm* agninis láctibus (*AP Nonius*).

(For a fuller list see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 123 sqq. Examples like the four last are disallowed by many editors.)

The Pronouns *tu*, *te*, when emphatic, are, as a rule, not wholly suppressed by Elision, but stand in this Prosodic Hiatus (unless when the fuller forms *med*, *ted* are used), e.g. *Cas.* 724 (just quoted):

Men. 1076 *tŭ* erus es; tu séruom quaere; tú salueto; tú uale.

It is often metrically possible to scan either with elision or with prosodic hiatus (e.g. *Ad.* 97). Editors generally take the former course, but we have in *Cas.* 709 an indication in favour of the other; for here the nature of the metre seems to require *sĭ ĕffēxis*:

si efféxis hoc soleás tibi dabo et ánulum in
digitum aúreum et bona plúruma,

and in *Bacch.* 989[a]:

út scias *quaĕ hĭc* scripta sient (Glyconic).

Perhaps the best plan to follow will be to suppose prosodic hiatus where there would be any stress on the word, e.g. *Mil.* 1124 quin sí uoluntate nólet, *uĭ* ĕxtrudám foras; also *vaé ĭlli*, &c. (on the normal incidence of ictus on *vae* in Dramatic Verse, see Richter in Studemund's *Studien*, i. 635); although, it must be confessed, we find instances of elision too, e.g. *Rud.* 249 Núnc abire hínc decet nós. Q(uo), amabo, íbimus?, Enn. *Trag.* 77 R. q(uo) ápplicem?, as well as of hiatus with unemphatic words, e.g. *Pers.* 778 qui súnt, *quĭ* erunt, quiqué fuerunt, quiqué futuri sunt pósthac. In *Most.* 1033 delúdificatust mé hodie indignís modis (*al.* med), 1035 delúdificatust m(e) hódie in perpetuóm modum, 1040 queis méd exemplis hódie ludificátus est, the different treatment of the Pronoun seems to be due to metrical exigencies only.

Similarly *ego*, *tibi*, *sibi*, when emphatic, e.g.

> *Pers.* 61 unde *égŏ* hunc quaestum obtíneo et maiorúm locum.
> *Men.* 389 ...*tíbĭ* et parasitó tuo.

In *Curc.* 369 we should probably leave *ego* in Prosodic Hiatus:

> tú tabellas cón[illegible]ato, hic ministrabit, *égŏ* edam.

Similarly the Possessive Pronouns, when emphasis is laid on them, stand in Prosodic Hiatus in lines like *Merc.* 479 (just quoted),

> *Aul.* 463 quí simulauit *méĭ* honoris míttere huc causá coquos (*P*, *A n. l.*).

In *Asin.* 147 we should therefore leave *tuo* in Prosodic Hiatus:

> túŏ facit iussu, *túŏ* imperio páret: mater tu, éadem era es.

Uti (under the Law of Breves Breviantes, *utĭ*; cf. *utĭn* Hec. 199), the fuller form of *ut*, is sometimes found in Prosodic Hiatus, e.g.:

> *Curc.* 43 ita *útĭ* occepi dícere: ei ancíllula est (sed íta uti *Ritschl*).

Richter in Studemund's *Studien*, i. 498, declares that this hiatus with monosyllables appears not to be tolerated in the penultimate thesis of Iambic and Trochaic Tetrameters. When metrical exigencies did not intervene and when the Pronoun or Conjunction had no special emphasis, I fancy that the choice of elision or hiatus was determined by the intonation of the sentence (see Appendix). Thus *qui* is elided before the emphatic *animum* in *Trin.* 312 *qu*(*i*) *ánimum vincant quam quos animus*, but before the enclitic *homo* (see Appendix) acquires a secondary accent and is left in hiatus in *Trin.* 305 &c., *quí homo.* Cf. *Trin.* 310 *tu s*(*i*) *animum vicisti potius qu*(*am*) *animus te* with *Trin.* 1068 *sí eris meritus, fiet.*

Of trisyllables, it is Cretic words which in non-dramatic Latin poetry exhibit this hiatus, e.g. Ennius' *Scipiŏ invicte* (*A.* 345 M.), *milia militŭm octo* (*A.* 354 M.), Catullus' *uno in lectulŏ* (*v.l.* lecticulo) *erudituli ambo* (57. 7), Virgil's *Peliŏ Ossam* (*G.* i. 281), and *insulaĕ Ionio in magno* (*A.* iii. 211). Since the elision of a final long vowel, diphthong or *-m* in such words is patently avoided in classical poetry (cf. Luc. Mueller *Res Metr.*[2] pp. 342, 347), we may believe that in Latin pronunciation this hiatus was actually existent. In Dramatic Verse this kind of hiatus is chiefly to be looked for in Anapaestic Metre, since the dialogue metres do not allow such a

division of syllables between words as exhibits the metrical form ⏑ ⏑, – (iii. § 7). But we find examples even in the dialogue metres when the initial syllable of the following word is short, e.g.

Poen. 988 pro dí ĭnmortales, *plúrimĭ* ad illúnc modum (cf. *AP*),
Poen. 176 se amáre uelle atque *óbsequĭ* animó suo (*P*, *A n. l.*).

(For other examples see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 133. Many editors disallow this Hiatus.)

Of other than Cretic words we find, e.g.:

Cas. 258 cuí *hominĭ* hodié peculi númmus non est plúmbeus (*P*, *A n. l.*).
Most. 259 úna *operă* ebur átramento cándefacere póstules (*P*, *A n. l.*).

(Other examples in Klotz, *ibid.*) The principle which determines the elision and non-elision of these final syllables in Plautus has not yet been detected. It was probably some secondary sentence-accent, which, in the obscurity that covers the whole of Latin sentence-accentuation (see Appendix), still remains beyond our ken. It is noticeable that in *Cas.* 157 (Cretic):

fáciam uti proínde ut est dignŭs uitám colat (*AP*),

Plautus changes *ut* to *uti*, presumably to avoid the hiatus *faciăm*|*ut*.

The abnormal hiatus in Ennius' epitaph (of unknown authorship and date):

aspicite, O cives, senis *Ennĭ* imaginis formam (? Ennii),

is quite isolated (cf. Enn. *A.* 588 M.). The rule is that in other than monosyllabic words the long syllable shortened in hiatus must be preceded by another short syllable, which along with the shortened syllable forms a resolved arsis or thesis.

41. But we also find monosyllables in Prosodic Hiatus that are equivalent to one 'mora.' They can sometimes be referred to word-groups, e.g. *dĕ-hordeo* in *Asin.* 706 (like *dĕhortor*, e.g. *Poen.* 674), *quămobrem* in *Amph.* 552, *tămetsi* in *Pseud.* 244:

demam hércle iam de hórdeo tolútim ni badízas (*P*, *Nonius*);
Sceléstissimúm te arbitrór. Nam quam ób rem (*P*, *A n. l.*)?
redi ét respice ád nos, tamétsi occupátu's (*P*, *A n. l.*);

but usually, perhaps always, they are better explained from the avoidance of the total suppression of a word by Elision, just as in the Greek Dramatists we find words like τί left unelided. Thus we have *cŭm hac cŭm istac* Cas. 612 (*AP*); *Most.* 392 *cŭm hac, cŭm ĭstac* (*P*, *A n. l.*).

Another example is:

Poen. 1054 *Năm* haúd repudio hospítium neque Cartháginem (*AP*).

(Cf. Skutsch in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, Jan. 27, 1894.)

The extent to which the Dramatists permit the total elision of monosyllabic words has not yet been properly investigated. (Cf. Maurenbrecher *Hiatus*, pp. 153 sqq.) Podiaski (*Troch. Sept. Terent.* p. 10) denies the statement that Terence never begins Trochaic lines with a wholly elided monosyllable. Seyffert

[redacted]

(*Berl. Phil. Woch.* xvi. 847) discredits the total suppression by elision of *i*, 'go,' in the Dramatists, e.g. *Poen.* 1116, *Epid.* 164. The Classical poets avoid the elision of words like *sim*, *qui* Plur., *do*, *re*, *dem*, *rem*, &c. (see Luc. Mueller *Res Metr.*[2] p. 399 for details). Plautus normally scans *tum-t(u)-igitur* (see Luchs in *Hermes*, 1874, p. 105); *qu(em)-ad-modum* (perhaps *quĕm ăd modum?* Mil. 186), e.g. *Merc.* 352 (bacch.); *t(am)-etsi* (cf. Lucil. v. 8 M.); *qu(am)-ob-rem* (but *quam-năm-ob-rem*, Mil. 360). *Amph.* 552, *Pseud.* 244 are in Bacchiac metre, the metre that permits *cŏepi* (§ 15).

42. From Metrical and Prosodic Hiatus we pass to Hiatus proper. This is found in Plautus in various circumstances:—

(3) before or after an Interjection (cf. C. F. Müller, *Plaut. Pros.* 723), e.g.

Truc. 161 O | Ástaphium, haud istóc modo solita és me ante appellåre.

Men. 731 eu | hércle, mulier, múltum et audax ét mala es.

Such hiatus is a feature of classical Latin poetry also.

(4) at a change of speaker, e.g.

Most. 798 Ut ístas remíttat sibí. | Haud opínor.

Poen. 698 Compléxum contrectáre. | Is, lenó, uiam.

For other examples, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 111. Cf. the Greek usage, e.g. Soph. *O. C.* 1757 (anap.): Πατρὸς ἡμετέρου. | Ἀλλ' οὐ θεμιτόν. We have also Syllaba Anceps at a change of speaker (§ 33).

The ground for the tolerance of Hiatus and Syllaba Anceps here is the same as in the case of Metrical Hiatus, the pause at the close of the first speaker's remark. At the end of a line a final vowel stands without necessity of elision though the next line begins with a vowel, because there is a marked interval between the end of one line and the beginning of the next. For the same reason a short syllable might play the part of a long syllable at the end of a line because the following pause made up for its defective quantity. In the middle of a long line, at the end of the first hemistich, there was a possibility of a break of the same kind, though the break was not of constant occurrence as at the end of the whole line, nor, when it did occur, of so marked a character. Hence it comes that at this part of the line we have either, on the one hand, hiatus and syllaba anceps, or, on the other, elision. With elision, there would be no perceptible break between the two halves of the line, as there would be none in such lines[1] as the Iambic Octonarii of *Amph.* 250—262, which describe in rapid narration the battle between the Thebans and the Teleboi, and which generally lack Diaeresis (iii. § 12). There is a similar break between the

[1] We may compare two lines of Tennyson's 'Locksley Hall,' the first without, the second with a break at the end of the hemistich:

"Many a night from yonder ivied casement ere I went to rest
Did I look on great Orion sloping slowly to the West."

remarks of the first and second speakers in lines with hiatus or with syllaba anceps, at the close of the first speaker's utterance; whereas, with elision, the second speaker may be supposed to begin at the moment that the first has finished. Varro appears to have recommended the use of the sign | (a vertical stroke) to indicate syllaba anceps (and hiatus?) due to a pause (*Serm. Lat.* iv. frag. 74, Wilm.): quare in huiuscemodi locis poni oportet notam | transversam inter syllabas, frequentius ad extremum versum senarium et similes, si pro longa brevem habebunt extremam, ut in hoc:

amicus summus méus et popularís Getă.

It is possible that traces of this symbol survive in our MSS. of Plautus (see Schoell's Introd. to *Truculentus*, p. xxxiv.).

43. Even where there is no change of speaker there may be as marked an interval between two utterances of the same speaker. This will make our fifth form of Hiatus,

(5) when the same speaker resumes after an interval. For example, in *Poen.* 685 Lycus addresses the first part of the line to the audience, then going up to Collabiscus he addresses the second part to him:

Blande hóminem compellabo. | hóspes hospitem
Salutat, &c. (*AP*),

where the interval would in an English play be indicated by stage-directions, thus:

LYC. (*aside*) Blande &c. (*to Collabiscus*) hospes &c.

Cf. *Stich.* 270:

Sed éccum Pinacium, éius puerum. | hóc uide (*AP*).

Similarly in *Most.* 484 Tranio first requests the attention of Theopropides, then after a pause begins his story:

Ego dícam: ausculta. | út foris cenáuerat
Tuos gnátus, &c. (*P*, *A n. l.*).

44. There is a danger of being over-fanciful in these matters, and of attributing modern stage-conventions of enunciation to the ancient delivery of quantitative verse with or without musical accompaniment. Still there may be warrant for adding other cases, more open to question, in which hiatus may have been tolerated by Plautus:—

(6) Any marked pause in the line, where utterance would observe the intervals of action or gesture, such as

(*a*) emphatic reiteration[1], &c., e.g.

Pseud. 673 híc argentum,—híc amanti amíca erili filio (*AP*).
Curc. 46 eam uólt meretricem fácere: | ea me déperit (*P*, *A n. l.*).

(*b*) asynthetic details of any kind[2], e.g. *Merc.* 745:

uidére, amplecti, | ósculari, | ádloqui (*P*, *A n. l.*),

Men. 476 prandí, potaui, scórtum accubui, | ábstuli (*AP*).

(*c*) When a letter is read aloud. When one thinks of the traditional way of reading aloud a letter on the modern stage, the pauses occasioned by the pretended difficulty of deciphering the writing, or by the affectation of incredulity or of astonishment at what the letter is found to contain, or by the meaning glances directed at the audience, one persuades oneself that the numerous cases of hiatus in passages like *vv.* 756 sqq. of the *Asinaria* may have really come from Plautus himself. The Parasite is reading to Diabolus the draft of the proposed contract with Diabolus' mistress, and, I fancy, emphasizes in the earlier part the different provisions of the contract by appropriate pauses:—

Aliénŭm hominem | íntro mittat néminem.
Quod illa aút amicum | aút patronum nóminet,
Forés occlusae | ómnibus sint nísi tibi.
In fóribus scribat óccupatam | ésse se (*P*, *A n. l.*).

Under this category may be mentioned Hiatus with *eccum*, 'ecce hunc,' 'see him here!,' and like words, which is strongly attested by the MSS. more than once:

(1) after *eccum*,

Most. 686 Euge óptume eccum | aédium dominús foras
Simó progreditur (*AP*).
Men. 567 Atque édepol eccum | óptume reuórtitur (*AP*).
Cas. 536 Séd ĕccum | égreditúr senati cólumen praesidiúm popli (*AP*).

(Cf. *Pers.* 392, ?*Pers.* 226, ?*Most.* 1127. Add *Capt.* 169, and see note);

(2) before *eccum* (less strongly attested),

Most. 560 Sed Philolachetis séruom | éccum Tránium (*P*, *A n. l.*).
Curc. 278 Videó currentem | éllum usque in platea última (*P*, *A n. l.*).
Men. 286 Peniculum | éccum in uídulo saluóm fero (*P*, *A n. l.*).
Aul. 781 ‖ímmo | éccillám domi (*P*, *A n. l.*).
Stich. 260 Ventrí reliqui | éccam quae dicát 'cedo' (*A*, eccam illam *P*).

1 Cf. Virg. *Ecl.* viii. 41 ut vidi, ut perii, | ut me malus abstulit error, *Ecl.* x. 13 illum etiam lauri, | etiam flevere myricae.
2 If the long vowel in hiatus was shortened, there will be no 'irrational' thesis in these Cretics, *Most.* 152: árte gymnástica, dísco, | hastís, pila, cúrsu, | armís, equo uíctitabám uolup.

The following examples of Hiatus in lines with *eccum* belong rather to no. (5):

Stich. 270 Sed éccum Pinacium eius puerum. | hoc uide (*AP*).
Aul. 712 Attát eccum ipsum. | íbo ut hoc condám domum (*P*, *A n. l.*).
Men. 898 Atque éccum ipsum hominem. | óbseruemus quám rem agat (*P*, *A n. l.*).

(*Pseud.* 410 and *Most.* 1120 are doubtful. Add *Truc.* 320.)

(*d*) between the clauses of an antithesis. Plautus allows Hiatus in lines like

Men. 881 Lumbí sedendo, | óculi spectandó dolent (*P*, and so quoted by Ausonius),
Pers. 550 Ŭrbis speciem uídi, | hominum móres perspexí parum (*AP*),

just as Virgil allows it in *Georg.* i. 4:

qui cultus habendo
sit pecori, | apibus quanta experientia parcis.

(*e*) before an emphasized word or emphasized initial syllable in such lines as

Poen. 89 Praesénti argento—hómini, si leno ést homo (*P*, *Nonius*),

where we should now-a-days indicate the interval by a dash after 'argento.'

Most. 1032 Turbáuit? Immo | éxturbauit ómnia (*P*, *A n. l.*).

It is not, I think, too fanciful to imagine that the speaker paused for a moment before selecting and articulating the suitable preposition for the Compound Verb '*ex*-turbavit' (cf. however v. 1112). There would be a pause, with a sly look at the audience, before uttering the soubriquet in *Amph.* 498:

cŭm Álcumena—úxore usurária (*P*, *A n. l.*).

Cf. *Stich.* 216.

I fancy that Prosodic Hiatus is justified by the same articulation of contrasted words in lines like:

Vidul. 87 Quom míhi qui uiuam cópiăm inopí facis (*A*, *P n. l.*) (*copia* from *cum* and *opi-*, *inops* from *in* and *opi-*),
Mil. 4 Praestríngat oculorum áciĕm in acie hóstibus (*P*, *Nonius*),
(?) *Epid.* 306 Nullum ésse opinor égo agrŭm in agro Áttico (*P*, *A n. l.*)
(cf. *Men.* 98 Nam illíc homŏ homines nón alit uerum éducat) (năm íllic?) (*P*, *Nonius*), though it must be allowed that Elision is frequent in such phrases, e.g. *Amph.* 278: Optumo optume óptumam operam dás, &c.

Alliteration gives prominence to initial syllables. Whether it may legitimize hiatus in lines like *Trin.* 540 is doubtful.

But Klotz's theory (*Grundzüge*, p. 108) that the utterance of a Proper Noun would be attended by a pause sufficient to justify hiatus, e.g.

Bacch. 354 senéx in Ephesum | íbit aurum arcéssere (*P*, *A n. l.*),

seems quite improbable, unless the hiatus can be referred to class (*e*), e.g.

Poen. 443 nam isti quidem hercle orátioni | Oédipo
opust, &c. (*AP*, *Priscian*).

In Naevius' famous description of a coquette, there is more than one example of Hiatus at a pause (*Com.* 75 R.):

quasi in choro pila
ludéns datatim dát se et communém facit,
aliúm tenet, alii ádnuit, alibí manus
est óccupata, | álii peruellít pedem,
alii dat anulúm spectandum, | á labris
alium ínuocat, cūm álio cantat, át tamen
aliís dat digito lítteras.

(The text and the line-arrangement are not free from doubt.)

Other examples of hiatus at a pause of some kind are:

Hec. prol. 1 Hecyra ést huic nomen fábulae; | haec cúm datast, &c.
Pseud. 349 Í, gladium adfer. Quíd opus gladio? Quí hūnc occidam—
átque me (*AP*).
Stich. 221 logós ridiculos uéndo. | age, licémini (*AP*).
Most. 498 hic hábito; | haec mihi déditast habitátio (*P*, *A n. l.*).
Curc. 334 quód tibist, itém sibi esse, mágnam argenti—ínopiam. (*P*, *A n. l*)
(*ἐξ ἀπροσδοκήτου* for *copiam*).
Men. 1158 uénibunt serui, supellex, fúndi, | aedes: ómnia (*P*, *A n. l.*).
(f. et aed. *edd.*)
Merc. 530 Ego té redemi: | ílle mecum oráuit. Animus rédiit (*AP*).
Men. 1038 sáluom tibi ita ut mihi dedisti réddibo. | hic mé mane
(*P*, *Nonius*).

(For a fuller list see Klotz *Grundzüge*, pp. 104 sqq.)

Similarly Syllaba Anceps is the result of a pause of this kind. For example, the treatment of the last syllable of *venibit* as a long syllable seems to be justified by the pause that would certainly precede the mention of the climax in *Men.* 1160:

uénibunt serui, supellex, &c.
uénibīt—uxór quoque etiam, sí quis emptor uénerit (*AP*).

The 'hiatus Homericus' of a final vowel before a similar initial vowel, e.g. *λᾶαν ἄνω* | *ὤθεσκε ποτὶ λόφον*, which Aulus Gellius (VI. XX. 6) declares Catullus to have imitated with his *ebria* | *acina ebriosioris* (xxvii. 4), cannot be ascribed to Plautus (cf. *Stich.* 730 *únam amic*(*am*) *amámus*, *Merc.* 888 *Tú*(*am*) *amicam*. *Quid mé*(*am*) *amicam?*).

Lachmann's law of Elision seems not to be observed, e.g. *Poen.* 515 *plebei*(*i*) *et pauperes*. So scan *Pers.* 409 *pecunia*(*i*) *accipiter*, etc.

III. METRE.

Relation to Greek Models.

1. To understand Plautine Metre we must regard it as the last stage in the development of Greek Dramatic Metre. Its differences from its model are for the most part cases of progression along the same line as was followed on Greek soil, though some are due to a divergence on Latin soil, caused by the different character of the Latin and Greek languages. The free admission of trisyllabic feet (§ 7) into the Iambic and Trochaic lines of Plautus, as compared with those of Aeschylus and Sophocles, is merely a continuation of the course taken by the Greek Comedians themselves; the removal of the restrictions of this or that Metre to the expression of this or that feeling (§ 4), and the stichic use (i.e. the use in continuous passages) of some metres (e.g. Bacchiac, § 26, versus Reiziani, § 49) which were originally employed merely as occasional variations,—all this marks the last stage reached in the development of Greek Metre, a stage reached probably by the Alexandrian Dramatic writers. On the other hand, the great regard paid to the natural accent of words is something quite alien to Attic poetry, and is a result of the transference of Greek Metre to a country where the accent was an accent of stress and not an accent of pitch or tone, like the Greek (*Lat. Lang.* iii. § 1). The complete avoidance of such an incidence of ictus as *trahère*, *retrahère*, *detrahère*, and the partial avoidance of *perdère*, *disperdère* is due to the harsh effect produced by the clash of the natural accentuation, *tráhere*, *pérdere* with such an ictus (see Appendix).

For a fuller discussion of the relation of Latin to Greek Dramatic Verse, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 3 sqq.

2. The Roman Tragedians found models for cantica in the choruses of their Greek originals. Thus Ennius' Anapaests in the opening canticum of his *Iphigenia* are a reproduction of those of Euripides (quoted in § 21); though we cannot suppose the Bacchiac passage in his *Thyestes* (vv. 303—6 R.) to have had any parallel in a Greek Drama of the fifth or even fourth century (§ 26). But Plautus cannot have been indebted for his cantica to Menander or any other poet of the New Comedy. The chorus, with its strophic and anti-

[redacted]

strophic responsion, was characteristic of the Old Comedy and ceased to exist when the Athenian Empire fell. The New Comedy restricted itself to 'dialogue-metres,' especially the Iambic Trimeter. In Menander indeed there are traces of Anapaestic passages (for details see Blass in *Hermes* xxxiii. 655); but, so far as the extant fragments allow us to judge, this metre was used to a very limited extent. Moreover Menander and Diphilus are mentioned as having employed the 'Metrum Eupolideum' (Mar. Vict. p. 104, 4 K.); and the 'Versus Diphilius' takes its name from Diphilus; but yet Plautus cannot be supposed to have derived his wealth of metre from these poets. The *Miles Gloriosus*, probably one of the earliest of Plautus' plays, with its exclusive use of Iambic and Trochaic metres, except in one Anapaestic passage (vv. 1011—1093), seems to give a fairly correct impression of the New Comedy type. So do the plays of Terence, in which lyric metres are hardly found at all; although both he and Plautus are charged with a far more extended use of Tetrameters than they found in their originals[1]. Of Plautus' plays we may add the *Asinaria* (127—137 Cretic), and the *Mercator* (vv. 335—363 Bacchiac and Anapaestic), which are almost wholly expressed in Iambics and Trochaics, whereas in a play like the *Casina* nearly every actor is provided with a song. The cantica in Roman adaptations from the New Comedy thus appear to have been an element added from some foreign source in obedience to the dramatic requirements of the time. In Plautus the cantica are monodies, not part-songs of a chorus[2], so that a derivation of them

[1] Marius Victorinus (fourth century A.D.), p. 78, 20 K.: scio plurimos adfirmare Terentianas vel maxime fabulas metrum ac disciplinam graecarum comoediarum non custodisse, id est quas Menander, Philemon, Diphilus et ceteri ediderunt. nostri enim in modulandis metris seu rhythmis veteris comoediae scriptores sequi maluerunt, id est Eupolin, Cratinum, Aristophanem. prologos itaque et primarum scaenarum actus trimetris comprehenderunt, deinde longissimos, id est tetrametros subdiderunt, qui appellantur quadrati. postea in consequentibus variaverunt: modo enim trimetros, modo addito quadrante vel semisse posuerunt, id est semipede adiecto vel integro pede iambo vel sesquipede. haec per medios actus varie; rursus in exitu fabularum quadratos, quales diximus in secunda scaena, locarunt. Cf. Quintilian's verdict on Terence's plays (x. i. 99): plus adhuc habitura gratiae si intra versus trimetros stetissent. For examples of the substitution of Latin Tetrameters for Greek Trimeters see Terence *Hecyra* 286 sqq. (=Apollodorus Carystius 'Εκυρά frag. 10 K.), 380 (='Εκ. frag. 11), Ennius *Medea Exul* frag. viii. R. (=Eurip. Μήδ. 366 sqq.), etc., etc. The Trochaic Tetrameter was, after the disuse of Saturnian Verse, the 'popular' metre of Rome, used, for instance, by soldiers in their rude songs at triumphs, e.g.:

écce Caesar núnc triumphat quí subegit Gállias.

[2] The fishermen in the *Rudens* and the overseers (*lorarii*) in the *Captivi* do not correspond in any way to the Greek chorus. Probably one of the number was spokesman for the rest.

from the choric strophes and antistrophes of Aristophanes is not wholly satisfactory. Besides, certain features of Plautus' Cantica are unlike anything in Aristophanes; for instance, the combination of certain metres in the same canticum, and especially the stichic use of some metres which are employed only as an occasional variety by the Greek Comedian (§ 1). Monodies make their appearance in the closing period of the Old Drama, a famous instance being the song of the Phrygian slave in the *Orestes* (vv. 1369—1502) with its novel combination of all kinds of metres; and in this point, as in so many others, Euripides appears as the founder of the later Dramatic school. How far the Middle Comedy differed from the Old in this respect we do not know. At Alexandria the Monody was much cultivated. The legitimate drama had been succeeded by what might be called Music Hall songs (μαγῳδίαι, ἱλαρῳδίαι, etc.), whose singers wore the dress and acted the part of the personage depicted in the verses.

The pretty little song recently discovered in Egypt[1] is apparently one of these; for its stichic use of Dochmii cannot be satisfactorily paralleled from the Attic Drama. Twenty successive lines (vv. 24—43) are Dochmiac Monometers: Μέλλω μαίνεσθαι, || Ζῆλος γάρ μ' ἔχει, etc.

Prof. Leo[2] has accordingly proposed the very plausible theory that Plautus found his models for his Cantica in the contemporary Hellenistic μαγῳδίαι or ἱλαρῳδίαι, which were much in vogue at Tarentum and other parts of Magna Graecia, and doubtless in Rome itself. It is to these that he would look for the immediate models for Plautus' stichic use of the Bacchiac metre (§ 26), the Versus Reiziani (§ 49), and for all the new types which occur in the Roman dramatists.

A comparison by Aulus Gellius (II. xxiii.) of a passage of Caecilius with the original passage of Menander, gives us an interesting example of the way in which a Roman Comedian, for the sake of variety, substituted a lyric-passage or song for the dialogue-passage of his original. Menander's lines are Iambic Trimeters:

ἐπ' ἀμφότερα νῦν ἡ 'πίκληρος ἡ καλὴ
μέλλει καθευδήσειν. κατείργασται μέγα

[1] Published by Mr B. Grenfell under the title of *an Alexandrian Erotic Fragment* (Oxford, 1896). For its metrical character see Wilamowitz in *Nachrichten der Götting. Gesellschaft*, 1896, p. 231.

[2] *Die Plautinischen Cantica und die Hellenistische Lyrik*, Berlin 1897, an extract from the Proceedings of the Göttingen Society (*Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse*, Neue Folge, Band I., no. vii.).

[redacted]

καὶ περιβόητον ἔργον· ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας
ἐξέβαλε τὴν λυποῦσαν ἣν ἐβούλετο,
ἵν' ἀποβλέπωσι πάντες εἰς τὸ Κρωβύλης
πρόσωπον ᾗ τ' εὔγνωστος οὖσ' ἐμὴ γυνὴ
δέσποινα. καὶ τὴν ὄψιν ἣν ἐκτήσατο
ὄνος ἐν πιθήκοις τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον
ἔστιν. σιωπᾶν βούλομαι τὴν νύκτα τὴν
πολλῶν κακῶν ἀρχηγόν. οἴμοι Κρωβύλην
*λαβεῖν ἔμ' ἑκκαίδεκα τάλαντα * * **
τὴν ῥῖν' ἔχουσαν πήχεως. εἶτ' ἐστὶ τὸ
φρύαγμά πως ὑπόστατον; μὰ τὸν Δία
τὸν 'Ολύμπιον καὶ τὴν 'Αθηνᾶν, οὐδαμῶς.
παιδισκάριον θεραπευτικὸν δὲ τοῦ δόμου
θᾶττον ἀπάγοι τις ἢ 'τέραν ἂν εἰσάγοι.

Caecilius renders this by a polymetric Monody, consisting apparently of Anapaestic Tetrameters (1—3), Trochaic Tetrameters (4—8), Bacchiacs (9—10), Cretics (11—13), an Iambic Senarius (14), Glyconics (15), though the exact reading of the Latin as well as of the Greek passage is here and there doubtful:

is démum miser est, qui aérumnam suam néscit occultá re
ferre: íta me uxor forma ét factis facit, sí taceam, tamen índicium,
quae nisi dotem omnia quaé nolis habet: quí sapiet de mé discet,
quí quasi ad hostis cáptus liber séruio salua úrbe atque arce.
dum éius mortem inhio, égomet inter uiuos uiuo mórtuus.
quaén mihi quidquid plácet eo priuátum it me, seruátum <eam>?
éa me clam se cúm mea ancilla aít consuetum. id me árguit:
íta plorando, orándo, instando atque óbiurgando me óbtudit,
eam utí uenderém. nunc credo ínter suás
aequális, cognátas sermoném serít:
'quís nostrarúm fuit íntegra aetátula
quae hóc idem á uiro
ímpetrarit suo quód ego anús modo
efféci, paelice út meum priuarém uirum?'
haéc erúnt concília hodié: differár sermóne misér.

And in the *Stichus* of Plautus we have apparently two versions of the opening passage, taken from two different editions of the play, the one version in Iambic Senarii (vv. 48—57, omitted in the Ambrosian Palimpsest), the other in lyric metres (vv. 1—47). The *Liber Glossarum*, a mediaeval Latin dictionary, drawn in part from ancient sources, contains this statement: apud Romanos quoque Plautus comoediae choros exemplo Graecorum inseruit.

3. Since however these character-songs of the Hellenistic world may themselves be regarded as developments of the lyrics of Euripides and Aristophanes, we are justified in looking to the extant choruses of these earlier Dramatists for types which may have become popular on the Alexandrian stage and have passed ultimately to Rome.

The Versus Reizianus, for example, a characteristic type in Roman Comedy, used in continuous passages by Plautus (§ 49), is found in Aristophanes *Pax* 954 and elsewhere:

φυσῶντι καὶ πονουμένῳ || *προσδώσετε δήπου.*

The curious couplet at the opening of the *Persa*:

Qui amáns egens ingréssus est prínceps in Amorís uias
súperauit aerúmnis *is* suís aerumnas Hérculi,

appears in *Lysistr.* 299—301 &c.:

κἄστιν γε Λήμνιον τὸ πῦρ τοῦτο πάσῃ μηχανῇ.
οὐ γὰρ ἄν ποθ' ὧδ' ὀδὰξ ἔβρυκε τὰς λήμας ἐμοῦ.

The 'Versus Diphilius' (⏔ ⏑ ⏑ ⏔ ⏑ ⏑ ⏔ ⏒ ⏔ ⏑ ⏑ ⏔ ⏑ ⏑ –), e.g. Aristoph. *Pax* 775:

Μοῦσα σὺ μὲν πολέμους ἀπωσαμένη μετ' ἐμοῦ,

has been recognised in *Curc.* 96—7:

flos ueteris uini meis naribus obiectust.
eius amor cupidam me huc prolicit per tenebras,

and in *Cas.* 644[1]:

iam tibi ístuc cerebrum dispercutiam, excetra tu.

(On the curious lines in the *Stichus*, vv. 11 sqq., which seem to be modelled upon acephalous Glyconics in combination with the Colon Reizianum, as in Aristoph. *Eq.* 1141 sqq., *Eccl.* 291 sqq., see § 51; on the 'Choriambo-Trochaics' of *Bacch.* IV. iii. see § 42.)

4. But a large number of features of the Greek Dramatic metres are inevitably absent from the Latin. The old associations of various metres must have been lost. Anapaests could no longer be recognized by a Roman audience as the metre appropriate to a march (§ 25), nor Cretics as the conventional form of a hymn to Apollo. Syncope, or the suppression (i.e. merging in a neighbouring long syllable) of a short thesis, is hardly to be looked for in the Iambic and Trochaic parts of Plautus' Cantica; and though this or that special type of syncopated verse, which had become popular on the Alexandrian stage, may be reproduced by him, its true nature was probably not recognized. The opening line of the *Persa*, quoted above, was to Plautus probably an Iambic Dimeter Acatalectic (*qui amáns, egens ingréssus est*) followed by a Trochaic

[1] The *Casina* was an adaptation of the *Clerumenoe* of Diphilus (*Cas.* prol. 32).

Dimeter Catalectic (*princeps in Amoris vias*), whereas to Aristophanes v. 299 of the *Lysistrata* was an Iambic Tetrameter Acatalectic with 'syncope' of the first thesis of the third 'metrum' (*τοιοῦτο πάσῃ μηχανῇ*).

That curious 'Anaclasis' of Iambic metre, whereby a Choriambus (– ⏑ ⏑ –) takes the place of an Iambic metrum (⏓ – ⏑ –), which appears in the Greek choruses (and on special occasions even in dialogue-passages, e.g. Παρθενοπαῖ|ος and φαιοχίτω|νες), was probably not practised by Plautus. (On its use in Greek see Wilamowitz *Herc. Fur.* ii. p. 190.)

Nor have we reason to think that Plautus allowed a piece of prose to break the continuity of his verse, as Aristophanes did, e.g. *Eq.* 941 *εὖ γε νὴ τὸν Δία καὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ τὴν Δήμητρα.*

But the Epiphonema, i.e. extra-metrical Interjection or address, e.g. *Nub.* init.:

ἰοὺ ἰού,
ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τὸ χρῆμα τῶν νυκτῶν ὅσον,

is familiar to Plautus, e.g. *Cas.* 619:

attat,
quid illúc clamoris, óbsecro, in nostrást domo?

(Cf. *Epid.* 181, Ter. *Phorm.* 485. Mar. Vict. 85 attests this usage.)

Some would find a syncopated Iambic Octonarius in *Cas.* 168: nam ubi domi sóla sum sopór manus cáluitur (usually scanned as a Cretic Tetrameter); a syncopated Trochaic Trimeter Catalectic in *Cas.* 731: *A.* út ego opinor nisi resistis. *B.* Ὦ Ζεῦ (probably an Ionic Trimeter); a syncopated Iambic Septenarius in *Curc.* 102: nam ubi tú profusu's, ibi egŏ me péruelim sepúltam; an Iambic Octonarius with one 'anaclastic' metrum in *Trin.* 247: ibi illa pendentém ferit; i(am) ămplĭŭs ōrat; nón satis. (On the 'Choriambo-Iambics' of Ter. *Ad.* IV. iv. see § 46.)

The question how far strophic arrangement can be found in Plautus' Cantica is discussed by Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 305; cf. Leo, *Plaut. Cant.*, p. 77.

5. The Colometry (in unscientific language, the arrangement in lines) of Plautus' Cantica, an arrangement which has been referred with some probability to the end of the second century B.C. (Leo, *Plaut. Cant.* 6), is not always easy to determine. The two ancient recensions of the text which are represented by our two families of MSS. (i. § 17) seem occasionally to have differed in this point. Thus *Pseud.* 1329—30 appear in the 'Ambrosian' recension as a long Bacchiac series:

A. Quid núnc? numquid íratus és aut mihi aút filió prop-
-ter hás res, Simó? *B.* Nil profécto.

A. Ĭ hác: te sequór. *B*. Quin uocás spectatóres simŭl? *A*. Hercle me ísti hau solént,

but in the 'Palatine' recension as a Bacchiac Trimeter Catalectic followed by a long Cretic series:

A. Quid núnc? numquid íratus és
Aút mihi aut fílio própter has rés, Simo?
B. Níl profectó. *A*. Ĭ hac: té sequor. *B*. Quín uocas
Spéctatorés simŭl? *A*. Hércle me isti haú solent.

(Cf. § 33; and for fuller details of the 'Ambrosian' and 'Palatine' Colometry, Studemund, *de Canticis Plautinis*. Berlin, 1864.) Unfortunately the original Colometry of the 'Palatine' recension has been to a great extent obscured in the extant representatives of the 'Palatine' family, owing to the scribe of their immediate original (*P*) having combined two or more short lines into one long line, and in various ways having departed from the colometry of the proto-archetype for the sake of saving space[1]. Where we have not the testimony of the Ambrosian Palimpsest we are often left in great uncertainty regarding the proper arrangement of a Canticum. The discussion whether Plautus used this or that peculiar length of line, i.e. the Bacchiac Trimeter, is scarcely profitable, since, in the first place, in a large number of Cantica we cannot be sure of Plautus' own distribution of the lines, and in the second, where there is a 'system' or continuous run of a particular metre, the division of this 'system' into lines is usually a mere matter of caprice.

The Anapaestic 'system,' *Pseud.* 1315 sqq., was written in the 'Ambrosian' recension in Tetrameters, in the 'Palatine' as Dimeters; and most cases of divergence in the 'Ambrosian' and 'Palatine' Colometry are merely equivalent methods of writing down a metrical 'system.' The curious 'clausulae,' which are a feature of the Colometry of the Ambrosian Palimpsest, seem to indicate a metrical 'system': e.g. *Cas.* 673, a bacchiac passage, written in *A*:

A. Quid cum ea
negoti tibist? *B*. Peccaui:
illud dicere uilicum uolebam,

might be printed thus:

A. Quid cúm ea negóti tibíst? *B*. Peccaui: íllud dicére uilicúm uolébam,

as seven Bacchii (the sixth defective, § 33), or thus (Trim. and Tetram.):

A. Quid cúm ea negóti tibíst? *B*. Pec-
-caui: íllud dicére uilicúm uolébam,

[1] We infer the Colometry of P^A:
(1) from T, (2) from the occasional retention in P (i.e. BCD) of capital letters as the initials of words which in P^A began the line, (3) from a sifting of the evidence afforded by the actual division of the lines in P.

or thus, with the abnormal *dicére* in its proper place (Tetram. and Trim.):

A. Quid cúm ea negóti tibíst? *B.* Peccaui: íllud
dicére uilicúm uolébam.

What we call Synaphea of lines, i.e. the elision of a vowel at the end of one 'line' before the initial vowel of the next, is of course another feature that will vary according to the way in which we choose to print the cola or lines of a 'system.' It appears, for example, in this distribution of the Anapaests in *Aul.* 724 (they may also be written as one long line):

sedúlō? egomet me défraudau(i)
animúmque meum geniúmque meum,

of the Cretics in *Epid.* 173—4 (the distribution in the Ambrosian Palimpsest):

A. Béuereor filium. *B.* At pól ego te crédid(i)
uxórem, quam tu éxtulisti, pudore éxsequi.

6. The dialogue-metres of the Latin Dramatists do not compare (as metres) very unfavourably with their Greek originals in the few cases in which the latter have been preserved. Take for example the opening lines of Ennius' *Medea Exul* and Euripides' *Medea*:

Utinám ne in nemore Pélio secúribus
caesa áccidisset ábiegna ad terrám trabes,
neue índe nauis íncohandi exórdium
coepísset, quae nunc nóminatur nómine
Argó, quia Argiui ín ea delectí uiri
uectí petebant péllem inauratam árietis
Colchís, imperio régis Peliae, pér dolum.
nam númquam era errans méa domo ecferrét pedem
Medéa, animo aegra, amóre saeuo saúcia.

εἴθ' ὤφελ' Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος
Κόλχων ἐς αἶαν κυανέας Ξυμπληγάδας,
μηδ' ἐν νάπαισι Πηλίου πεσεῖν ποτε
τμηθεῖσα πεύκη, μηδ' ἐρετμῶσαι χέρας
ἀνδρῶν ἀριστέων, οἳ τὸ πάγχρυσον δέρας
Πελίᾳ μετῆλθον. οὐ γὰρ ἂν δέσποιν' ἐμὴ
Μήδεια πύργους γῆς ἔπλευσ' Ἰωλκίας,
ἔρωτι θυμὸν ἐκπλαγεῖσ' Ἰάσονος.

It must not be supposed that the Latin Iambics and Trochaics are quite inartistic reproductions. In some respects the Roman writers follow stricter laws of composition than the Greek. They are more particular with regard to Caesura. While Iambic Trimeters without Caesura are frequent in Aristophanes[1], they are rare in

[1] The poets of the New Comedy are more careful in the matter of Caesura than Aristophanes (see Perschinka, *Dissert. Philol. Vindob.* iii. p. 366).

Plautus and Terence, and in many of the cases where they occur some special effect is aimed at. Thus *Men.* 750, with its scanty Caesura, suits the staccato tone of a surprised question:

negás nouisse mé? negas patrém meum?

as also *Most.* 946 (cf. *Bacch.* 257):

Érus hic noster pótat. Erus hic uóster potat? Ita loquor;

and *Trin.* 1094 is comically appropriate to the tone of reproach:

O Cállicles, O Cállicles, O Cállicles;

there is dogged obstinacy in the rhythm of *Pers.* 373:

dicát quod quisque uúlt: ego de hac senténtia
non démouebor;

while the impatience of the speaker is expressed by the defective rhythm of *Asin.* 325, a Trochaic Septenarius:

quín rem actutum edísseris? cupió malum nancíscier.

Sometimes the absence of Caesura is necessitated by the exigencies of fitting long words into a line, e.g. *Aul.* 510 *flammárii, uiolárii, carinárii.*

For fuller details, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 187 sqq. Seyffert in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift* xviii. 977 points out how often a caesura-less Iambic Senarius has Diaeresis at the fourth foot, e.g. *Stich.* 300:

secúndas fortunás decent || supérbiae.

Another matter in which the Roman Dramatists are more careful than the Greek is their avoidance of a monosyllabic ending of Iambic and Trochaic lines.

For details, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 188 sqq., 248. He points out that Terence and Ennius (not Plautus) are favourable to a monosyllabic ending after elision, e.g. *Eun.* 859: conséruam? uix me cóntineo, quin inuolem in (capillum, &c.). (Cf. *Men.* 592.) Full details regarding Terence's practice are given by Fabia in *Rev. Philologie*, xvii. 32.

Leo seems right in his protest (*Plaut. Cant.* 8) against the attribution to Plautus of such metrical 'barbarisms' as 'Iambic' (or Trochaic or Anapaestic) 'Tripodies,' 'Pentapodies,' etc., 'brachycatalectic' and 'hypercatalectic' lines, and the like.

Still it must be allowed that the introduction of Spondees into the 'even' feet of Iambic and the 'odd' of Trochaic lines spoils the rhythmical effect of these lines in the Latin Drama. It was eschewed by more fastidious imitators of Greek Iambics, like Catullus and his successors (except Phaedrus). (For details see Luc. Mueller, *Res Metr.*[2] pp. 524 sqq.)

The patriotism of some Roman writers on Metre led them to defend this concession on the ground that it makes verse a more exact reproduction of every-day speech (Mar. Vict. p. 132, 28 K.; Terent. 2237 K. in metra peccant arte, non inscitiâ).

What harmonious effects can be attained even with this concession we see from the graceful prologue in which Laberius makes his dignified remonstrance to the Dictator who had forced him to appear on the stage:

Necéssitas, cuius cúrsus transuersi impetum
noluérunt multi effúgere, pauci pótuerunt,
quo mé detrusit paéne extremis sénsibus!
quem núlla ambitio, núlla umquam largítio,
nullús timor, uis núlla, nulla auctóritas
mouére potuit in iuuenta dé statu:
ecce in senecta ut fácile labefecit loco
uiri éxcellentis ménte clemente édita
summissa, placide blándiloquens orátio!
etenim ipsi di negáre cui nil pótuerunt,
hominém me denegáre quis possét pati?
ego bis tricenis ánnis actis sine nota
equés Romanus é Lare egressús meo
domúm reuertar mímus. nimirum hóc die
unó plus uixi mihi quam uiuendúm fuit.
Fortúna, inmoderata in bono aeque atque in malo,
si tibi erat libitum litterarum laúdibus
floris cacumen nóstrae famae frángere,
cur cúm uigebam mémbris praeuiridántibus,
satisfácere populo et táli cum poterám uiro,
non fléxibilem me cóncuruasti ut cárperes?
nuncine me deicis? quó? quid ad scaenam ádfero?
decórem formae an dignitatem córporis,
animí uirtutem an uócis iucundaé sonum?
ut hédera serpens uires arboreás necat,
ita mé uetustas ámplexu annorúm necat:
sepúlcri similis níl nisi nomen rétineo.

A. Iambic.

7. The Iambic Trimeters of the New (and Old) Comedy shew 'resolved' or trisyllabic[1] feet to a much greater extent than the Trimeters of Aeschylus or Sophocles. The tribrach and anapaest are admitted into all feet (except of course the sixth), the dactyl into all the 'odd' feet, the third and fifth (as well as the first). Even a quadrisyllabic foot, the proceleusmatic[2] (◡ ◡ ◡ ◡), is occasionally found, e.g. *λέγε ταχύ* in Plato Com., fr. 188 K.:

οὗτος, τίς εἶ; λέγε ταχύ. τί σιγᾷς; οὐκ ἐρεῖς;

[1] Cf. Hephaestion, p. 152 W.: *κωμικοῦ δὲ (ἰαμβικοῦ μέτρου) ἴδιον τὸ καὶ ἐκ τρισυλλάβων ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον συγκεῖσθαι.*

[2] *Προκελευσματικός* is the form found in Greek, *proceleumaticus* (without *s*) in Latin writers. For details of the use in Latin Iambic Verse of this foot, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 347 sq., C. F. Müller, *Nachträge zur Plautinischen Prosodie*, Berl. 1871, pp. 56 sqq.

The Roman imitators of the New Comedy continue these concessions to resolved feet, and extend them by admitting the dactyl into the 'even' feet too. But at no period of Greek Dramatic Poetry is the iambic rhythm of the line sacrificed by the admission of spondees into the second or fourth feet[1]. On the transference of the metre to Roman soil however this barrier is broken down. Plautus admits spondees into all feet (except of course the last).

Caesius Bassus (ap. Rufin. *Metr. Terent.* 556 K.), the friend and teacher of Persius, severely criticized that line of Terence which Horace was able to turn, with slight alteration, into a dactylic hexameter (*Sat.* II. iii. 264; cf. Persius v. 161), viz. Eun. 49:

exclúsit : reuocat : rédeam? non, si me óbsecret.

Thus the second foot is composed of a spondee (*-mūtē-*) in such a line as:—

uin cómmutemus? túam ego ducam et tú meam?

A spondee-word or word-ending, however, such as would involve marked discrepancy of metrical ictus from the natural accent, is not favoured. Thus a line is not very frequently found of such a form as:

uin cómmutem? uin túam ego ducam et tú meam?

where the 'irrational' thesis is the accented syllable of the word.

On the regularity of Caesura in Latin Iambic Verse see § 6. The Caesura in the Senarius usually follows the first thesis of the second metrum and is sometimes 'latent' Caesura, e.g. *Trin.* 759:

Potin ést ab amic(o) alicúnde exorarí? Potest.

(For fuller details see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 187 sqq.)

Here are some examples of this unusual type of spondee:—

Trin. 410 Quam si tu obicias fór*micis* papáuerem (*AP*, *Charisius* 83: Quam si formicis obicias papauerem *Nonius* 220).
Curc. 371 Beátus uideor: súb*duxi* ratiúnculam.
Capt. 192 Ibo intro atque intus súb*ducam* ratiúnculam.

They are usually due to the necessity of getting polysyllabic words into the line. A fuller list is given by Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 325 sqq., from which it appears that a form like *sălūtāndō*, *ĭtă cūrsū* is less avoided than a form like *fórmicis*. The

[1] Iambic, like Trochaic and Anapaestic Metre, was scanned by Dipodies, not by single feet. The chief metrical ictus of the line, in other words the syllables at which the baton of a conductor keeping time would fall, were in an Iambic Trimeter the 2nd, 4th and 6th Arses (in a Trochaic Tetrameter the 1st, 3rd, 5th and 7th). Hence the necessity of exhibiting the metre in its pure form at hese parts of the line (Bassus ap. Rufin. 555 K.; Terent. 2246 sqq. K.).

rule has also been stated in this form: 'Before a final polysyllable which is commensurate with an Iambic 'metrum' a spondee-word or word-ending with clash of ictus and accent is tolerated.'

Elision redeems the rhythmical fault. No exception is taken to a line like *sin cómmut(em) autem? túam ego ducam et tú meam?* Elision in the last foot of an Iambic Senarius is not much favoured by Roman Dramatists, e.g. *Men.* 898 *quam r(em) agat.* (For details, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 247.) Two spondee-words (or word-endings) with clash of ictus and accent are never found together, e.g. 'consúl, censór' (Klotz, p. 327). On monosyllabic endings of lines see § 6.

8. Spondees play a great part in the lines of the Roman Dramatists[1]. The fifth foot is more frequently a spondee than anything else, so that the 'Law of the Cretic' observed by the Greek Tragedians[2] is quite unknown in Latin Comedy or Tragedy. The fifth foot may be an iambus only in the line-endings (1) , ⏑ – ⏑ ⏒, (2) ... ⏑, – ⏑ ⏒[3], e.g. *imaginem*, *ubi ambules*, *iamque se-daret*, and occasionally (3) ⏑ (,) ⏑ ⏑ –, ⏑ ⏒, e.g. *reue|niúnt domum*, *in al|iúm diem*, *erus o|perám dare.* (On this occasional ending see Luchs in Studemund's *Studien auf dem Gebiete des Archaischen Lateins* I. i.) But an iambic line (Senarius, Octonarius, &c.) or hemistich may not end with two iambus-words (which indeed are avoided at any part of the line; cf. Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 237; Seyffert in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift* xviii. 976), nor with an iambic ending followed by an iambus-word. Thus *Capt.* 5 Sed ís quo pacto séruiat suo síbi patri would not be metrical if we changed the ending to *suó sibi seruiát pătrī*; nor *Poen.* 1334 in séruitute hic fílias habuít tuas, if the order were *habuit filiās tŭās.*

The ending *malam crucem* is allowed to end a line, because the phrase constituted a single word-group, being capable of taking an attributive Adjective, e.g. *maxumam malam crucem*:

Cas. 611 Ducás easque in máxumam malám crucem.

The reason why two iambus-words were avoided was probably that the recurrent discrepancy between metrical ictus and word-accent was unpleasing. In *Amph.* 991 *Patĕr vocát me* the last two words would probably be pronounced together with accent on the last syllable of *vocat*, owing to the enclitic nature of the Pronoun, *vocát-me*. So *bonan fide* is allowed to end an Iambic line, because *bonan* had the accent on the last syllable, *Most.* 670 Tuus émit aedis

[1] In the Greek New Comedy too we find Spondees in the odd feet (especially the third and fifth) rather more frequently than Iambic and Trisyllabic feet together. In Seneca's Tragedies the fifth foot is, we may say, always a Spondee. (Cf. Diomedes, p. 507 K.: Iambus tragicus. hic, ut gravior iuxta materiae pondus esset, semper quinto loco spondeum recipit.)

[2] Not by the Greek Comedians to the same extent.

[3] By a comma is indicated the ending of a word.

filius. Bonán fide? On other exceptions, or apparent exceptions, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 245.

9. In the treatment of Anapaests, Dactyls (and Proceleusmatics) care is taken by the Latin Dramatists (as by their Greek models) that these feet shall not be markedly out of proportion to the Iambus which they represent. Where one short syllable was the final of one word and the other short syllable the initial of a following word, the pause inevitable between the words added to the time of such an Anapaest or Dactyl, and made them unsuitable for use in Iambic (or Trochaic)[1] verse. So while Tribrachs are freely divided between words, an Anapaest of this form ... ⏑, ⏑ ⏑́, and a Dactyl of this form ⏑́ ⏑, ⏑ ... are not favoured, unless the two words are closely joined in pronunciation, like *propter-amorem* (see Appendix) in *Mil.* 1284:

alium álio pacto próptĕr ămōrem ní sciam.

To express the rule differently, the two syllables of a resolved thesis in Iambic (or Trochaic) Verse should not belong to separate words. Since the thesis of Iambic or Trochaic metre is properly a short syllable, the resolution of the thesis is really the substitution of two short syllables for one, and is itself 'irrational.' But its 'irrational' character would be unduly increased by the pause that inevitably attends upon the conclusion of a word.

In the first foot of the line, however, Plautus freely allows such an Anapaest (in Trochaic Verse, a Dactyl, § 16), e.g. *Mil.* 28:

Ăt ĭndíligenter íceram. Pol sí quidem, &c.,

and indeed a small, subordinate word like *at* would be in pronunciation joined with the longer neighbouring word (see Appendix), so that a division like *ăt ĭndĭligenter* would hardly be avoided at any part of the line.

Klotz, *Grundzüge* p. 304, is wrong in denying that the first foot of the line or hemistich was different from the others in respect of word-division (see Seyffert in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1891, p. 925). In the New Comedy, where the admission of trisyllabic feet into the Iambic Trimeter most nearly approaches the Latin usage, these feet are not divided between words, unless the words are closely connected. This division is found especially in the first foot (for details see Perschinka in *Dissert. Philol. Vindob.* iii.).

The division of a resolved arsis is not open to the same 'à priori' objections as the division of a resolved thesis, since the arsis in Iambic and Trochaic verse is a long syllable and is the metrical equivalent of two short syllables. Still, it is true that an Anapaest of this form ...⏑́, ⏑ –, and a Dactyl of this form –⏑́, ⏑... is not quite the same as a trochee or an iambus. Even though it is the (long) arsis and not the (properly short) thesis that is resolved, the division

[1] Not Dactylic or Anapaestic Verse.

[redacted]

of this resolved arsis between words, i.e. the addition of the pause at the end of a word to the time occupied by the two short syllables, must have been felt, when the thesis was a long instead of a short syllable, to increase somewhat unduly the length of the dactyl or anapaest, and make them rather more than a fair equivalent of an iambus (or trochee). It is only in the first foot of the line (or hemistich) that such a dactyl (or in Trochaic verse an anapaest) is freely admitted by Plautus and Terence, e.g.:

Haut. 237 pĕrgín ĭstuc priŭs diiúdicare, &c.

For full details of the presence and permissibleness of these divisions in the Iambic and Trochaic lines of the Early Dramatists, see Maurenbrecher, *Hiatus und Verschleifung* pp. 25 sqq. *Merc.* 773–4 will serve as example of the unfavoured (v. 773) and the permissible (v. 774) divisions:

cur híc astamus? quín abimŭs? ĭncómmodi
si quíd tĭb(i) ĕuénit, íd non est culpá mea (*AP*).

The list given by Klotz on pp. 257 sqq. of his *Grundzüge* is to a great extent based on the wholly unwarranted assumption that the Law of Breves Breviantes (ii. § 16) is controlled by the metrical ictus of the verse, and not by the actual pronunciation of every-day life. Klotz accordingly will not recognize the pyrrich scansion of any iambus-word whose two syllables do not belong to the same arsis or thesis, and so scans, for example, *apŭd* instead of *apŭd* (the invariable scansion before a noun, ii. § 19) in *Pseud.* 645 (trochaic), which ends *rés agitŭr ăpŭd iúdices*; *sciō* instead of *sciŏ* in *Hec.* 398 (trochaic):

dicam abortum essĕ: sciŏ nemini áliter suspectúm fore,

where the strong pause between *esse* and *scio* would make the division ⏑, ⏑ – very harsh indeed; *ubi* instead of *ubĭ* in *Aul.* 204 (trochaic):

crédo edepŏl, ŭbĭ méntionem ego fécero de filia,

though why *ubi* in the phrase *ubi mentionem ego fecero* should be refused the possibility of the pronunciation *ubĭ* is hard to see (cf. *Phorm.* 827 *séd ubĭ nam*, an Iambic hemistich-ending). This theory that Plautus admits the ictus *quós ubi* or *quos úbi* (Dactyl), *ubi quós* or *úbi quos* (Anapaest), *úbi quis* (Tribrach), but not *quis ubí* (Tribrach), is usually defended by an appeal to Anapaestic Verse, in which we have numerous examples like *Poen.* 1185 *et pól egō quóm* (cf. *Rud.* 188 *hancine egō pártem*), but very few like *Poen.* 1180 *tantús ibĭ cliéntarum*, and these, from the nature of the case, nearly always capable of another scansion, e.g. *ibĭ cliĕntarum* (Seyffert in Bursian's *Jahresbericht* 1895, p. 260). But the character of Anapaestic Verse, with its predilection for Diaeresis (§ 21), is unfavourable to such a collocation of syllables as ... ⏑́, ⏑⏑, ⏑–́..., and the preference of a scansion like *pól egō* to *pól egŏ* in an anapaestic line is really due to the exigencies of the anapaestic metre. The scansion and pronunciation *egŏ* was the rule, *egō* the exception, as early as Plautus, in whose dialogue-metres we have Trochaic line-endings like *ét egŏ vos*, Mil. 1138 (cf. *pol egŏ nunc*, Rud. 238, Cretic), even under the stringent conditions which regulate this part of the line[1]. Unluckily for Klotz's theory the appeal to Anapaestic Verse proves too much. It involves the rejection of *pól egŏ* as well as of *pól ubĭ*.

[1] Seyffert (*Berl. Philol. Wochenschr.* xviii. 1577) shews that *potin(e)*, *viden(e)*, *abin(e)*, &c. are not allowed to represent an Iambus at the end of a line or hemistich in Plautus.

An Anapaest so divided, ... ⏑ ⏑, –, or a Proceleusmatic so divided, ... ⏑ ⏑, ⏑ ⏑, is also avoided. Editors therefore change the reading of *Most.* 40 that is offered by the MSS.:

germána inluuies, rústĭcŭs hírcus, hára suis.

But the instances of this division, as of the last-mentioned, seem to be too numerous to be set aside altogether (see Maurenbrecher, *Hiatus* pp. 25 sqq.), e.g.:

Truc. 213 huic hómini amanti méa era apud nos naéniăm dĭxit dé bonis (*AP*: dixit domi *Festus*).
Phorm. 266 hic in nóxĭăst, ĭlle ad défendendam caúsam adest. (noxast *edd.*)
Ad. 60 uenĭt ád me saepe clámĭtăns 'quĭd ăgis, Mício?' (clamans *edd.*)

In Trochaic Verse an anapaest or proceleusmatic of this kind would involve the illegitimate metrical ictus *rustĭcus*, &c. (§ 1). In fact, the suitable place in Iambic or Trochaic verse for an arrangement of syllables of this kind ... ⏑⏑, – would be the beginning of the line or hemistich. A word like *rusticus* may be scanned as a dactyl in Trochaic verse only at this place in the line (§ 16), while the metrical ictus *rustĭcus* is tolerated only at the same place in an Iambic line (§ 1). But an arrangement like ... ⏑⏑, ⏑ ..., e.g. *rusticus ager*, is quite unobjectionable in Iambic Verse, scanned *-tĭcŭs ă-*, a tribrach. And when the two short syllables are not the ending of a polysyllabic word, even an anapaest and a proceleusmatic become quite permissible, e.g. *mălă mé* or *mălă mĭhĭ*.

10. The Iambic Tetrameter Catalectic (in Latin called Iambic Septenarius) shews in the Greek Comedians invariably the ending ⏑ – ⏓, with the 7th foot an Iambus. The ending of a line like Aristoph. *Thesm.* 547 (⏑ ⏑ – ⏓):

ἐγένετο Μελανίππας ποιῶν Φαίδρας τε Πηνελόπην δέ,

is an exception, due to the exigency of bringing the Proper Name into the line. But in Latin there is the greatest freedom in the Septenarius ending, for the 7th foot may be Iambus, Spondee, Anapaest, Dactyl, or even Proceleusmatic, e.g.

Pers. 281 Dicísne mi, ubi sit Tóxilus? Dico, út perpetuō pérĕas (dactyl),
Pers. 286 Nam egŏ mé confido líberum fore, tú te numquām spéras (spondee).

For fuller details see Mohr, *de iambico apud Plautum septenario*, 1873; Meissner, *de iambico apud Terentium septenario*, 1884. If the line ends with a monosyllable, however, the 7th foot is always an Iambus, e.g. *Mil.* 1253:

Ut quaéso, amore pérditast te misera! Mutŭóm fit,

unless elision or another monosyllable precede, e.g. *Rud.* 303 *nobis spes est* (cf. 683, 684). (For details see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 228.) And when the 7th foot

is an Anapaest or Proceleusmatic the second short syllable of the resolved thesis may not be a long syllable shortened by the Law of Breves Breviantes. Thus a line may end with e.g. *era iussit*, but not with e.g. *eraš iussa* (ii. § 29).

Marius Victorinus (p. 135, 25 K.) says of the Iambic Septenarius: frequens hoc comicis metrum et praecipue antiquae comoediae scriptoribus nostri quoque Plautus et Caecilius et Turpilius non aspernati sunt, Atellanarum autem scriptores appetiverunt: est enim iocosis motibus emollitum gestibusque agentium satis accommodatum.

11. The fourth foot of a Septenarius normally, and usually of an Octonarius (Tetram. Acatal.), when there is Diaeresis at the end of the hemistich, is an Iambus. Such Diaeresis is the rule in Septenarii and is as frequently present as absent in Octonarii.

Hiatus and Syllaba Anceps (ii. § 37) are allowed at the end of the hemistich. We have both in the same line in

Mil. 1226 Namque édepol uix fuit *cópiă* | adeúndi atque impetrándi.

Mil. 1239 Si pól me nolet *dúcerĕ* | uxórem, genua ampléctar.

Other examples are:

Asin. 419—20 qui látera conterám *tuă*, quae occálluere plágis. (But cf. § 8.)
abscéde ac sine me hunc *pérderĕ*, qui sémper me ira incéndit.
Asin. 591 Cur mé retentas? Quía *tui* | amáns abeuntis égeo.
Asin. 634 quas hódie adulescens *Diabolŭs* ipsi daturus díxit.

Septenarii with irregularity of Diaeresis seem to occur in

Truc. 163 sed blánde, quom illuc quód apŭd uōs || nunc ést, apŭd med habébam (rather *apŭd uōs*; cf. ii. § 19).

Curc. 125 omnés: mihi haud saepe éuĕnīūnt || talés hereditátes (probably *ueniunt*, possibly *euenunt*).

Asin. 552 qui saépe ante in nostrás scăpŭlās || cicătrīces indidérunt (*scaplas*?).

Cist. 312 nimis lépide exconcinnáuīt hāsc(e) || aedīs Alcesimárchus (scarcely -*uit*, ii. § 1).

Mil. 361 Respīcedum ad laeuam; quís illăec ēst || muliér? Pro di immortáles (*AP*).

Poen. 1245 et praédicabo quó mŏdŏ uōs || furtá faciatis múlta (*AP*) (scarcely *quŏmŏdŏ*, ii. § 13).

Poen. 1265 Nam nóstra nutrix prīmūm mē || cognóuīt. Ubi ea, amábo, est? (*AP*).

Rud. 386 Sed dúce me ad illum ubi ést. Ī sān(e) || in Véneris fanum huc intro.

Septenarii without Diaeresis are rare; with 'latent' Diaeresis frequent, e.g.:

Rud. 318 tortís superciliis, contracta frónte, fraudulénti.
Rud. 304 nisi quíd concharum cápsimus incenáti sumus profécto.
Mil. 358 credo égo istoc exempló tib(i) esse péreundum extra pórtam.
Rud. 1322 quid dáre uelis qui istaéc tib(i) inuestīgēt indicétque?

(For details see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 196, 212.) Octonarii without Diaeresis are suitable for rapid narration, e.g. *Amph.* 251—262; cf. 1076—1085. (Other instances in Klotz, p. 212.)

12. Iambic 'systems' in Cantica are not infrequent, sometimes written in Octonarii, sometimes in Dimeters and the like. For the use of the Iambic Dimeter Acatalectic as a 'clausula' to end a period Varro (*Serm. Lat.* frag. 67 Wilm.) quotes Accius' line (665 R.): *an haéc iam obliti sínt Phryges?* In *Cas.* 709 sqq. we have a curious run of the 'metrum' ⏑⏑–⏑–:

Sí efféxis hoc, soleás tibi dabo, et án-
ulum in digitum aúreum et bona plúruma.
Operám dabo.
Face ut ímpetres, &c.

(Cf. the 'pes thymelicus' (–⏑⏑⏑–), on which see § 38.)

In *Amph.* 1067 (and elsewhere) we find an arrangement of this kind:

ut iácui, exsurgo. ardére censui aédis, ita tum cónfulgebant.
íbi me inclamat Álcumena; iam éa res me horrore ádficit.

(For further details see Leo, *Plautinische Cantica*, p. 33.)

13. In Terence a sudden change from Iambic to Trochaic metre or 'vice versa' is common enough. A single line at the end of a soliloquy, where the speaker changes his tone, often exhibits this change, and any sudden change of sentiment in a dialogue-passage is indicated by this change of metre. In Plautus the intermixture of Iambic and Trochaic lines is used to express unusual excitement or emotion. Examples will be found in *Capt.* 529 sqq. (where Tyndarus is in momentary expectation of being detected), *Capt.* IV. i. (where Ergasilus hurries with the news of Philopolemus' arrival), *Amph.* V. i. (Bromia's account of the portents at the birth of Hercules, vv. 1053 sqq.), e.g. vv. 1063—4

ubi quísque instíterat, cóncidit crepitu. íbi nescioquis máxuma
uóce exclamat: 'Álcumena, ádĕst auxilium, né time.'

It is possible that we have Terence's use of the change in *Bacch.* 404 and other passages (e.g. *Amph.* 252 sqq.). Mar. Victorinus (57. 14 K.) says: nam et Menander in comoediis frequenter a continuatis iambicis versibus ad trochaicos transit et rursum ad iambicos redit. On the blending of Iambic and Trochaic Metre in the same line, see § 4. For fuller details cf. Klotz, *Grundz.* p. 471.

B. Trochaic.

14. In Trochaic Verse, the prevalent types being the Septenarius or Tetrameter Catalectic and the Octonarius or Tetrameter Acatalectic, the same resolved feet are allowed as in Iambic Verse;

[redacted]

that is to say, beside the trochee and the spondee, we have the tribrach, the dactyl, the anapaest, and occasionally the proceleusmatic. The two last are not allowed by the Greek Dramatists.

Aul. 730, with its numerous resolved feet, well expresses the agitation of the speaker:

íbeam an maneam, an ádeam an fugiam? quíd agam?—edepol néscio.

For details of the somewhat limited use of the Proceleusmatic in Latin Trochaic Verse, see Klotz, pp. 348 sqq. and C. F. Müller, *Nachträge*, pp. 56 sqq. According to Abraham, *Stud. Plaut.* p. 228, it is allowed when the fourth syllable could not take the ictus, e.g. *Amph.* 442 *nímis similést*, where the ictus 'simileat' would be impossible.

Another example is *Trin.* 688:

núllum bĕnĕfícium ésse duco id, quóm, quoi facias, nón placet.

Ritschl, who disallowed a 'falling Proceleusmatic' in Dramatic Verse, proposed to read *benficium* (*Opusc.* ii. 720); but his views on this subject are now generally abandoned.

Podiaski, *Troch. Sept. Terent.* pp. 23 sq., gives details regarding the comparative frequency of different feet in the various parts of the Trochaic Septenarii of Terence.

15. The spondee, which in Greek is not admitted into the 'odd' feet, the metrically important feet of trochaic dipodies (§ 7), is in Latin admitted into all except the seventh of a Septenarius. But, as we found with spondees in the even feet of iambic lines, a marked discrepancy of metrical ictus from the natural accent of the word is avoided. The 'irrational' long syllable is not also the accented syllable as a rule.

Here are some examples of this unfavoured rhythm:

Capt. 898 *Aétern̄úm* tibí dapinabo uictum, si uera aútumas.
Trin. 648 Praéŏptauisti amórem tuum uti *uírtutí* praepóneres.
Capt. 258 Quós tam grandi sim mercatus *praésentí* pecúnia.

For a fuller list, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 325 sqq., and cf. above, § 7. Since a form like ⏑́⏑⏑–⏑́ is more tolerated than –́–́, he points out the greater likelihood of Prosodic Hiatus than of Elision in beginnings like *quóm ărgentúm* (Poen. 519), *cúm amicis* (Stich. 580), *nám ístorúm* (Poen. 584), &c.

16. The same unpleasing divisions of dactyls and anapaests between words (§ 9) are avoided in Trochaic as in Iambic Verse. For example, a dactyl of the type –́⏑, ⏑ ... is favoured only in the first foot (see § 9) of the line or hemistich, e.g. *Asin.* 508:

hóccine est pietátem colere, || mátrís ímperium mínuere?

Terence hardly allows it even in the first foot. We have in *Andr.* 857, a line beginning with *trístís sĕuéritas* (cf. *Phorm.* 863, 1012).

Other examples are:

Stich. 716 haúd tuum istuc est té uereri: || ĕrĭp(e) ĕx ore tíbias.

Naevius *Praet.* 6 R. Cómiter seném sapientem || cóntrā rĕdhostit méa salus.

A dactyl-word (or proceleusmatic-word) or word-ending is not allowed as a fair equivalent of a trochee, but is tolerated in the first foot of a line or hemistich, e.g. *Epid.* 3. A word made dactylic by elision is readily allowed, e.g. *érĭpĕr(e) óculos.*

As instances of the unfavoured division ⏑́⏑, ⏑ (with resolved thesis and long arsis) we may add:

Enn. *Trag.* 40 R. úbi illa <tua> paulo ánte sapiens uírginālis mŏdéstia?
194 R. égo proiector quód tu peccas: tú delínquis, ĕgo árguor.

Examples of the division of a resolved arsis with long thesis are:

Stich. 85 pérplexabilitér ĕārum hodie pérpaucĕfaciam péctora.
737 méa suauís, ămābilis, amoena, Stéphanium ad amorés tuos

(the ictus *amabilis* is abnormal, § 1). (For a fuller list see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 257 sqq., but note the remarks above in § 9.) On the rarity of Terence's admission of these licences, even in the first foot, see Podiaski, *Troch. Sept. Terent.* p. 9, Hauler's Introduction to the *Phormio*, p. 53.

17. The ending of a Trochaic Septenarius is more restricted than that of an Iambic Septenarius; for the seventh foot must be either a trochee or a tribrach. But even when followed by Diaeresis, the fourth foot may be a trochee, a spondee, a tribrach, an anapaest and even (occasionally) a dactyl, e.g.

Cas. 406 Quíd tibi istunc táctio ēst? Quiă Iúppiter iussít meus.

Bacch. 702 Núnc quid nos uis fácere? Nīl ĕnim, nísi ut ametis, ímpero (cf. ii. § 25).

This use of a Dactyl implies that the line is regarded as one long line and not as two hemistichs. So Hiatus (ii. § 37) would not be consistent with a Dactyl in the fourth foot. We may not scan *Curc.* 476: *in medio proptér canalem ibi ostentatorés meri* with *caná(lem) ibi · óstentatores* (see Skutsch in *Satura Viadrina*, p. 142).

The last syllable of the dactyl may be a syllable shortened under the Law of Breves Breviantes, e.g. *Trin.* 316, *Most.* 258.

For a fuller list see Skutsch in *Satura Viadrina*, p. 128. He adds as examples of a Proceleusmatic in this place *Amph.* 513, *Epid.* 302, *Pseud.* 704. For details of Terence's use of a dactyl see Podiaski, *Troch. Sept. Terent.* p. 16.

The rules stated in § 8 for the ending of the Iambic Senarius apply also to the ending of the Trochaic Septenarius, viz. that ⏑ –, ⏑ ⏑̆ is impermissible. In a line like *Cas.* 395 :

Tíbi permitto, túte sorti. Pérdis me. Lucrúm facit,

the ending *lucrum-facit* is apparently a word-group (i.e. a quadrisyllabic compound word) and does not break the rule.

18. Diaeresis at the end of the hemistich is normal in Octonarii and usual in Septenarii. Where it is not found at the end of the fourth foot, it generally appears at the end of the fifth, e.g.

Amph. 707 Nóluerit salutare. Inritábis crabronés. Tace.
Capt. 306 Qui ímperare insuéram, nunc altérius imperio óbsequor.

(For fuller details see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 209 sqq.)

Hiatus[1] is allowed at the end of the hemistich, e.g.

Men. 778 néscioquid uos uélitati | éstis inter uós duos.

For details regarding Caesura and Diaeresis of Trochaic Verse, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 187 sqq., Podiaski, *Troch. Sept. Terent.* p. 19, Franke, *Caesur. Sept. Troch. Plaut. et Terent.*, Halle, 1894.

19. Of trochaic 'systems' in Cantica may be quoted *Bacch.* 969 sqq., which may be arranged thus:

cépi spolia. is núnc ducentos
númmos Philíppos míliti quos
dáre se promisít dabit. nunc
álteris etiám ducentis
úsus est qui díspensentur
Ílio capto, út sit mulsum
    quí triumphent mílites,

on the pattern of passages like Aristoph. *Eq.* 621 sqq.:

κἂν μακρὰν ὁδὸν διελθεῖν
ὥστ' ἀκοῦσαι. πρὸς τάδ', ὦ βέλ-
-τιστε, θαρρήσας λέγ' ὡς ἅ-
    -παντες ἥδόμεσθά σοι.

(For fuller details, see Leo, *Plautinische Cantica*, p. 30.)

The 'excited' Trochees of the Greek Drama are well known from Aristoph. *Ach.* 204 sqq. (where the chorus rush on the stage in pursuit of Dicaeopolis):

τῇδε πᾶς ἕπου, δίωκε, καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα πυνθάνου, &c.

or from *Eq.* 247 sqq. (where the knights enter pell-mell):

παῖε, παῖε τὸν πανοῦργον καὶ ταραξιππόστρατον, &c.

[1] Syllaba Anceps is, of course, unrecognizable in Trochaic Verse. On Hiatus and Syllaba Anceps at the Diaeresis, see ii. § 37.

In Plautus we find Trochees similarly used, e.g. in *Aul.* 406 sqq. (where the cook hurries out of the house):

> áttatae ciués, populares, íncolae, accolae, áduenae omnes,
> dáte uiam qua fúgere liceat, fácite totae pláteae pateant,

although Anapaests often play this part, e.g. in the excited utterances of the miser Euclio over the loss of his hoard, *Aul.* 713 sqq.:

> perii, ínterii, occidĭ. quó curram? quo nón curram? tenĕ, ténĕ, quem? quis? &c.

But extreme agitation and the excited change of mood are best indicated by alternation of Iambic and Trochaic Verse (§ 13).

C. **Anapaestic.** (See Audouin, *de Plautinis Anapaestis*, Paris, 1898.)

20. In the Anapaestic lines of the Greek Comedians the spondee (– ⊥), dactyl (– ◡́ ◡), and occasionally the proceleusmatic (◡ ◡ ◡́ ◡) (e.g. Aristoph. *Nub.* 916 διὰ σὲ δὲ φοιτᾶν οὐδεὶς ἐθέλει) are admitted along with the anapaest (◡ ◡ ⊥). The same substitutes are recognized by Plautus. In the second part of the 'metrum[1]' the Greeks do not tolerate a dactyl unless the first part also is composed of a dactyl. Of this rule too we find at least a partial recognition (but cf. *Pers.* 781, quoted in § 22) in Plautus. (Fuller details in Klotz, pp. 281 sqq.)

21. But while Diaeresis is required in Greek at the end of the hemistich[2], and is often found at the end of each individual 'metrum,' it is not affected by Plautus to the same extent (e.g. *Pers.* 778, 782, quoted in § 22; *Stich.* 22, 24, 25, 30, 35, 315, 317, quoted in § 23). To follow the Greek practice closely would bring the metrical ictus into constant clash with the natural accent, a thing alien to the spirit of Latin verse (see Appendix), so that Latin Anapaests should be constructed on different principles. From a sentence of Marius Victorinus (iii. p. 77 K.) it appears that Pacuvius was the poet whose name was associated with a reformed type of Anapaests which better suited the genius of the Latin language. The lines quoted from him (*Trag.* 350 R.):

> Agite, íte, euoluite, rápite, coma
> Tractáte per aspera sáxa et humum,

[1] In the Anapaestic, as in the Iambic and Trochaic Metres, two feet are required for the 'metrum' or metrical unit of the line. Hence a Dimeter is composed of four 'feet,' a Tetrameter of eight 'feet.'

[2] Though the Greek Comedians occasionally dispense with it, e.g. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 568 κἂν μὴ τούτοις ἀναπειθώμεσ||θα, τὰ παιδάρι' εὐθὺς ἀνέλκει. We may illustrate the normal Diaeresis from our own accentual Anapaests: 'Over hill, over dale, thorough bush, thorough brier,' &c.

in contrast to the lines of Accius (*Trag.* 520 R.):

Inclýte, parua prodíte patria,
Nomíne celebri claróque potens
Pectóre, Achiuis classíbŭ́s ductor,

exhibit a reconciliation of natural accent and metrical ictus which is gained by the sacrifice of the Greek requirement of frequent Diaeresis. This Latin type (called 'dactylic' by Marius Victorinus) would be the product of a long experience, just as the adaptation of the Greek Elegiac (see Appendix) was the work of successive generations of poets. Pioneers, like Plautus, in the adaptation of the Greek metres to Latin poetry, would not readily hit upon the proper device for turning out smooth lines. And so it is in his Anapaestic Metres that we find the most marked discrepancy between natural accent and metrical ictus in the poetry of Plautus. It seems difficult to believe that the same poet, who in other metres so successfully reconciles accent with ictus, should tolerate lines like:

Trin. 239 blandíloquentúlus, harpágŏ́, mendáx,
Bacch. 1088 stultí, stolidí, fatuí, fungí, || bardí, blenní, buccónes,
Pers. 753 hostíbŭ́s uictís, ciuíbŭ́s saluís, etc.

And yet we must remember that the Greek requirements of the metre, viz. diaeresis usually at the end of the 'metrum' and always at the end of the hemistich, were requirements which necessitated in any Latin line constructed on this pattern a constant discrepancy between ictus and accent. Lines like these of Anaxandrides (frag. xli. 39 sqq. K.):

πουλυποδείων, χολίκων, δημοῦ,
φυσκῶν, ζωμοῦ, τευτλῶν, θριῶν,
θυννίδες ὀπταί, φυκίδες ἑφθαί,

could not be exactly reproduced except by lines like the above. No doubt a good many verses (e.g. *Trin.* 239?) have been referred to Anapaestic Metre in Plautus which really belong to other metres (e.g. Dactylic?); for the tendency of Ritschl's time to declare every verse that seemed difficult of scansion to be Trochaic has been succeeded by a tendency to call them all Anapaestic. Still it remains an undoubted fact that a large number of passages, unmistakeably Anapaestic, shew the most pronounced disregard of the word- and sentence-accent. Inferences with respect to the accentuation of Latin words cannot therefore be safely made from Anapaestic lines, except in the case of the Law of Breves Breviantes (ii. § 23). That the

mere 'metrical ictus' or cadence of the line could affect the pronunciation of the word is as untrue for Anapaestic Metre as for the other metres (§ 9; ii. § 17, § 29). The incidence, for example, of the metrical ictus on the last syllable of *dictus* in such a line as Accius 534 R.:

diuísus: eum dictús Prometheus,

does not make the final *s* contribute to length by 'position' (ii. § 3).

We may compare the Greek and Latin Anapaestic type in Ennius' *Iphigenia* (177 R.) and its original, Eurip. *Iph. Aul.* 6:

Quid nóctis uidetur in áltisono
caelí clipeo? Temó superat
stellás cogens etiam átque etiam
noctís sublime iter...
Tίς ποτ' ἄρ' ἀστὴρ ὅδε πορθμεύει;
Σείριος, ἐγγὺς τῆς ἑπταπόρου
Πλειάδος ᾄσσων ἔτι μεσσήρης.

Ennius' famous lines from the *Andromache* (81 sqq. R.) are not unrhythmical:

O páter, O patria, O Príami domus,
saeptum áltisono cardíne templum!
uidi égo te astante ope bárbarica
tectís caelatis, lácuatis,
auro, ébore instructam régifice,
haec ómnia uidi inflámmari,
Priamó ui uitam euítari,
Iouis áram sanguine túrpari.

A very fair adaptation of ictus to accent is found in the line preserved from Ovid's *Medea*:

feror húc, illuc, vae! pléna deo.

22. The favourite Anapaestic Metre in Plautus is the Tetrameter Catalectic and also Acatalectic.

The following passage of the *Persa* may serve to illustrate both forms (vv. 777 sqq.):

A. Qui súnt, quī erunt quiqué fuērunt quiqué futuri sunt pósthac,
solús ego omnibus antídeo facile, misérrimus hominum ut uíuam.
perii, ínterii, pessímus hic mi dies hódie inluxit córruptor,
ita mé Toxilŭs perfábricauīt itaqué meam rem diuéxauit.
uehiclum árgenti miser éieci, amisí, neque quam ob rem eiéci, habeo.
qui illúm Persam atque omnís Persas atque étiam omnis persónas
male di ómnes perdant, íta misero Toxílus haec mihi concíuit.
quia eī fidĕm non habui árgentī, eo míhi eas machinăs mólitust:
quem pól ego ut non in crúciatum atque in cómpedes cogam, sí uiuam,
sīquidem húc umquam erus rediérit eius, quod spéro—sed quid ego áspicio?
hoc uídĕ, quae haec fabulăst? híc quidĕm pol potánt. adgrediār. ó bone uir,
saluéto, et tu, bona líbertă. *B.* Dordálus hīcquidemst. *C.* Quin iúbe adirĕ.

B. Adĭ, sí libĕt. *C.* Agite, adplaúdamus. *B.* Dordále, homo lepidissúme, salue.
locus hic tuos est, hic áccumbĕ. fer[te] aquám pedibus. praebén [tu], puerĕ?
A. Ne sís me uno digito áttigeris, ne te ád terram, scelus, ádfligam.

For details of Diaeresis in Anapaestic Tetrameters, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 215 sqq. On its accompaniments, Hiatus and Syllaba Anceps, see above, ii. § 37.

When an Anapaestic line ends in a monosyllable the preceding foot must (see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 232) be an Anapaest, e.g. *Bacch.* 1160:

sed quíd ĭstuc est? etsí iam ego ĭpsĕ quid sít probe scirĕ pŭtṓ me.

23. The Anapaestic Dimeter is also common in Plautus.

Of the acatalectic form we may quote an example from the opening Canticum of the *Stichus* (vv. 18 sqq.). The passage is arranged in Dimeters in the Ambrosian Palimpsest, though it may also be treated as a continuous Anapaestic system, the various stages of which are marked by Catalexis (at v. 28, v. 32, v. 38):

A. Haec rés uitae me, sórŏr, saturant,
haec mihi diuidiae et sénio sunt.
B. Ne lácruma, sorŏr, neu túo id animo 20
fac quód tibi [tuos] patĕr faceré minatur:
spes ést eŭm melius fácturum.
noui égo illum: ioculo istaéc dicit,
neque ĭllé sibi mereat Pérsarum
montís, qui esse aureĭ pérhibentur, 25
ut istúc faciat quod tú metuis.
tamĕn sí faciat, minime irasci
(v. 28 Anap. Dim. Catal.)
nam uirĭ nostri domo ut ábiĕrunt,
hic tértius annus. *A.* Ita út memoras. 30
B. Quom ipsi interea uiuánt, ualeant
(v. 32 Anap. Dim. Catal.)
neque párticipant nos, néque redeunt.
A. An ĭd dólĕs, sorŏr, quia ĭlli súom ŏfficium 34, 35
non cólŭnt, quom tu tuŏm fácis? *B.* Ita pol.
A. Tacĕ sis, cauĕ sis audiam ego istuc.
(v. 38 Anap. Dim. Catal.), &c.

The same play may supply an example of the catalectic form (vv. 313 sqq.):

A. Deféssŭs sum pultándo.
hoc póstremumst. uae uóbis.
B. Ibo átque hunc compellábo. 315
saluṓs sis. *A.* Et tu sálue.
B. Iam tú piscator fáctu's?
A. Quam pridem non edisti? 318
(vv. 319—321 Anap. Tetram.)
pudŏr ádsit, non me appélles. 322
B. Possúm scire ex te uérum?
A. Potĕs: hódie non cenábis. 324, 325

24. Anapaestic Monometers often stand at intervals within an Anapaestic system in Greek, and very frequently are put before the last line (colon) for the purpose of marking the close of the system. In the penultimate line, for example, of a passage of the *Thesmophoriazusae* (vv. 824 sqq.) we have a *παρατέλευτον* of this kind:

τοῖς δ' ἡμετέροις ἀνδράσι τούτοις
ἀπόλωλεν μὲν πολλοῖς ὁ κανὼν 825
ἐκ τῶν οἴκων αὐτῇ λόγχῃ,
πολλοῖς δ' ἑτέροις ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων
  ἐν ταῖς στρατιαῖς
ἔρριπται τὸ σκιάδειον. 829

Leo (*Plaut. Cant.* p. 25) arranges in corresponding fashion *Stich.* 328—330:

A. Tu͡os inclama, tu͡i délinquont, 328
ego quíd me uelles uísebam (328^a)
nam mĕ́ quidĕm harum míserebat. 329
B. Ergo aúxilium properé latumst. (329^a)
  C. Quisnam híc loquitur 330
tam própe nos? *B.* Pinaciŭm. *C.* Úbi is est? (330^a)

although the Ambrosian Palimpsest agrees with the Palatine MSS. in writing the passage in three long lines.

25. The Anapaestic Metre, which seems to have held its ground to some extent even in the later Greek Comedy (§ 2), is the favourite metre of Plautus in his Cantica. Terence eschews it entirely, through dislike, I fancy, of that clash of ictus and accent which we have seen to be an inevitable accompaniment of Latin Anapaests (§ 21), and promotes the Iambic Octonarius to its place.

Anapaestic Metre in the Greek Dramatists often marks the solemn entrance of the chorus or of a leading personage on the stage. Since however this metre is the commonest metre in all the Cantica of Plautus, we are not warranted in selecting a particular passage where an entrance of this kind is described, and in supposing that Plautus was determined in his choice of this metre for this passage by the same considerations as appealed to the Greek Dramatists. The stock example of 'march-anapaests' in Plautus, viz. *Trin.* 840 sqq.:

sed quís hic est, qui in plateam íngreditur
cum nóuo ŏrnatu speciéque simul?
pol quámquam domī cupio, ópperiar,
  quam hic rĕ́m agāt animum aduórtam,

should be discarded by our text-books on Metre.

Was Sisenna referring to the Versus Reiziani of *Aul.* III. ii. (quoted in § 49), when he spoke of a scene of the *Aulularia* being composed of 'concisa anapaestica'? Cf. Sisenna ap. Rufin. p. 561, 9 K.: in Aulularia sic. 'haec scaena anapaestico metro est. Sed concisa sunt, ut non intellegas.'

D. Bacchiac.

26. This metre in the Greek Dramatists is of infrequent occurrence and of limited use. A single Bacchiac Tetrameter, for instance,

marks the approach of the Oceanides in Aeschylus, *Prom. Vinct.* v. 115:

τίς ἀχώ, τίς ὀδμὰ προσέπτα μ' ἀφεγγής;

A single Dimeter occurs in the conversation of the Chorus with Strepsiades in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, v. 708:

τί πάσχεις; τί κάμνεις;

two Dimeters or one Tetrameter in the invocation of Pallas, *Thesm.* vv. 1143—4:

φάνηθ', ὦ τυράννους
στυγοῦσ', ὥσπερ εἰκός.

But it is a favourite metre of Plautus, who makes no scruple of writing long passages in Bacchiac Tetrameters.

For example, in the *Amphitruo*, we have twenty-three consecutive Tetrameters, vv. 551—73:

A. Age í tu secúndum. *B.* Sequór, subsequór te.
A. Sceléstissimúm te arbitrór. *B.* Nam quăm ób rem?
A. Quia id quod neque ést nec fuit nec futúrum est
mihí praedicás. *B.* Ecceré, iam tuátim
facís, ut tuís nulla apúd te fidés sit.
A. Quid ést? quo modó? iam quidem hércle ego tibi ístam
sceléstam, scelús, linguam abscídam. *B.* Tuós sum,
proinde út commodúmst et lubét quidque fácias;
tamén quin loquár haec uti facta súnt hic,
numquam úllo modó me potés deterrére.
A. Sceléstissime, aúdes mihí praedicáre id,
domí te esse núnc, qui hic adés? *B.* Vera dico.
A. Malúm quod tibí di dabúnt, atque ego hódie
dabo. *B.* Ístuc tibíst in manú, nam tuós sum.
A. Tun mé, uerbero, aúdes erúm ludificári?
tune id dicere aúdes, quod némo umquam homo ánt(e)hac
uidít nec potést fieri, tempore úno
homo ídem duóbus locís ut simúl sit?
B. Profécto ut loquór res ita ést. *A.* Iuppitér te
perdát. *B.* Quid malí sum, ere, tua éx re proméritus?
A. Rogásne, improbe, étiam, qui lúdos facis me?
(v. 572, of uncertain text.)
B. uerum haúd mentiór, resque uti facta dico. 573

In the *Mercator* we have another long passage in Tetrameters, here and there interrupted by other metres, vv. 335—360:

Homó me misérior nullúst aeque opínor,
neque áduorsa cuí plura sint sempitérna;
(vv. 337—41.)
ratús clam patrém me meúm posse habére: 342
Is résciuit ét uidit, ét perdidit me;
neque is eum rogét quid loquár cogitátumst,

ita ánimi decem in pectore incerti cértant. 345
nec quíd corde núnc consilí capere póssim
sció, tantŭs cúm cura meóst errōr ánimo,
dum sérui meí perplacét mi consilium,
dum rúrsum haud placét nec patér potĭs uidétur
indúci ut putét matri ancíllam emptam esse illam. 350
nunc sí dico ut rés est atque illam mihí me
emísse indició, quem ad modum éxistumét me?
atque illam abstrahát, trans mare hinc uenum aspórtet;
sció saeuŏs quám sit, domó doctus. ígitur 354
(v. 355.)
iăm hinc olim inuítum domo éxtrusĭt áb se, 356
mercátum ire iússĭt: ibi hóc malum ego inuéni.
(v. 358.)
nequídquam abdidi, ábscondidi, ábstrusam habébam:
muscást meŭs patér; nil potést clam illum habéri. 360

Passages of from five to ten lines are very common. The metre has thus in Plautus a prominence which it entirely lacks in the Greek Dramatists, and the Bacchiac Tetrameter might fittingly be called the 'versus Plautinus.'

27. The bacchīus (⏑ ´– ´–) may be replaced by the molossus (– ´– ´–), or ionicus a minore (⏑ ⏑ ´– ´–), or fourth paeon (⏑ ´⏑ ⏑ ´–), or choriambus (– ´⏑ ⏑ ´–), or second paeon (⏑ ´– ´⏑ ⏑), or ionicus a majore (– ´– ´⏑ ⏑). In other words, (1) the short thesis may be replaced by a long or by two short syllables, (2) either of the two long arses may be resolved into two short syllables.

Thus in the passages quoted above, we have:

a molossus in *Amph.* 557 *ābscídām*, 560 *nūmqu(am) úllō*, *-tērrérĕ*, 566 *quōd ném(o) ūmq-*, 567 *uidĭ́t nēc*, 571 *quī lúdōs*, 573 *uēr(um) haúd mēn-*; *Merc.* 335 *nūllúst aēq-*, &c., &c.,

an ionicus a minore in *Amph.* 565 *-dĭfĭcári*,

a fourth paeon in *Amph.* 558 *-quĕ fáciās*, 563 *ĕg(o) hŏdĭē*, 571 *-prŏb(e) ĕ́tiām*; *Merc.* 335 *misĕ́riōr*, 345 *ĭt(a) ánĭmi*, 354 *-tŭs ígitŭr*,

a choriambus in *Amph.* 570 *prōmĕrĭtŭs*; *Merc.* 347 *-rōr ánĭmō*, 348 *cōnsílĭūm*,

a second paeon in *Amph.* 556 *quĭd(em) hĕ́rcl(e) ĕgŏ*, 570 *mălí s(um) ĕrĕ*; *Merc.* 346 *-sĭlí căpĕ-*, 349 *pătér pŏtĭs*, 357 *ĭb(i) hṓc măl(um) ĕg-*,

an ionicus a majore in *Merc.* 360 *mūscást mĕŭs*.

Examples of the other two substitutes, with four short and one long syllable are rare:

⏑ ⏑ ´– ´⏑ ⏑ *Cist.* 673 quae in térgum meúm ne *uĕnĭánt mălĕ* formído.
Most. 316 *ĭtă mḗ mălĕ* conuíui sermónisque taésumst (v.l. *ĭtă m(e) ĭ́bĭ mălĕ*).

– ´⏑ ⏑ ´⏑ ⏑ *Andr.* 637 *ūt támĕn* '*ŭbĭ* fidés?' si rogés, nil pudént hic.

[redacted]

28. The most common of these substitutes is the molossus. The use of a molossus (– –́ –́) for a bacchius (⏑ –́ –́) is, like the use of a spondee for an iambus (§ 7), restricted by considerations of the accentuation of the word. At the end of the line or hemistich (i.e. in the second or fourth foot of the Tetrameter) a molossus, which would involve too great a conflict of the metrical ictus and the accent of pronunciation, is avoided. For example, in the passages from the *Amphitruo* and *Mercator* quoted above, the molossi in 'even' feet in *Amph.* 560 (*de*)*tērrḗrē*, *Merc.* 345 (*incer*)*tī cḗrtānt*, 350 *ēss*(*e*) *íllām*, 353 *āspórtēt*, 356 *īnuítūm*, 357 *īnuénī*, &c. exhibit under metrical ictus the same syllable as receives the stress of the voice in pronunciation. The 'irrational' thesis is not formed by a syllable on which the chief stress of the voice falls. In the first foot of *Amph.* 567, *uīdít nēc*, we find a clash of the metrical ictus *uidít* and the natural accent *uídit*; the 'irrational' thesis *uī-* is the stress-syllable. It is especially in the first foot that a thesis of this kind is tolerated, but it is found also in the third.

29. With all these possible substitutes for the bacchius the metre is often in danger of being obscured. Thus in the passages quoted above, *Merc.* 350 has a bacchius only in the second foot, *Merc.* 351 only in the fourth foot, but molossi in the rest. But Plautus seems to have required that each Bacchiac line should contain at least one foot with proper short thesis, whether a bacchius (⏑ – –), or a fourth paeon (⏑ ⏑ ⏑ –), or a second paeon (⏑ – ⏑ ⏑). However, though this is the only law which will cover all Bacchiac lines in Plautus, it must be remembered that the pure bacchius is the predominant foot, and that the Bacchiac character of a passage is generally well marked, even though an occasional line shews a large intrusion of the other feet which are allowed as substitutes.

Doubt therefore attaches to the correctness of the text or of the Bacchiac treatment of lines like:

Poen. 218 postquam aúrora inlúxit, numquám concessámus (un-Plautine?).
Truc. 566 haec cúm uideo fieri, suffúror, suppilo (rather Anapaestic).
Truc. 95 ad fórēs auscultátē | atque ádseruate aédis (see § 35).
Titinius 103 R. nunc hóc uror, núnc haec res mé făcit festinem (Anap.).

We have thus a criterion for distinguishing a Colon Reizianum from a 'contracted' Bacchiac Dimeter (§ 33). For example, in the *Casina* (vv. 842—3) we have a Bacchiac Tetrameter followed by the short line:

corpusculūm malacum.

This cannot be scanned as a Bacchiac 'contracted' Dimeter, for the Bacchiac nature of – – | ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – is unrecognizable. It must be a Colon Reizianum.

When a line ends with a monosyllabic word, the thesis of the last foot must be pure. Thus in the passages quoted above we have in *Amph.* 551 *-sĕquór te*, 555 *fidĕs sit*, 557 *tŭós sum*, &c. (Other examples in Klotz, *Grundzüge*, p. 231.) This rule is not binding, (1) when the final monosyllable is preceded by another monosyllable, e.g. *extrusit ab se* Merc. 358, (2) when the monosyllable is preceded by elision, e.g. *sĕdat(um) it* Curc. 118.

30. When the short syllable that forms the thesis of a Bacchiac foot is replaced by two short syllables, they usually belong to the same word as the first arsis (Klotz, p. 343). They certainly should not be the final syllable of one word and the initial syllable of another, for the pause that naturally comes at the close of a word unduly extends the time occupied by the two-syllabled thesis. A rare instance of a foot of this kind is the second foot of *Poen.* 240:

soror, cogita amábo | itém nos perhibéri,

where *-gĭt(a) ăm-* constitute the thesis. (For the similar law against the division between words of the two-syllabled thesis of an anapaest, the substitute for an iambus, see § 9.) When either arsis is resolved into two short syllables, these are the equivalents of a long, and not a short, syllable; so the same objection cannot be made to their division between words. Still division of this kind is unusual even in the case of these resolved arses. The two short syllables generally belong to the same word. When they do not, they are usually formed of a monosyllabic (or elided disyllabic) word and the initial syllable of a disyllabic word. Thus in the passages of the *Amphitruo* and *Mercator* quoted above the instances of resolved arsis (indicated by suprascript ◡) are *Amph.* 556 *quide(m) hércl(e) ĕgŏ*, 558 *-que făcias*, 563 *eg(o) hŏdie*, 570 *mali s(um) ĕrĕ*, 570 *promĕritus*, 571 *-prob(e) ĕtiam*; *Merc.* 335 *misĕrior*, 345 *it(a) ănimi*, 346 *-sili căpĕ-*, 347 *-ror ánimo*, 348 *consilium*, 349 *patér pŏtis*, 354 *-tus ígitur*, 357 *ib(i) hóc măl(um) ĕg(o)*, 360 *muscást mĕŭs*. In all of these the two short syllables are comprised within a single word with one exception, viz. *Merc.* 357:

mercátum ire iússit: ibi hóc *măl(um) ĕg(o)* inuéni,

where both are formed of elided disyllabic words.

Other examples of the separation of the syllables of a resolved arsis are:

Cist. 686 nulla ést *nĕqu(e) ĕgo* sum úsquam. perdita perdidít me.
Truc. 713 nunc dum ísti lubét, *dŭm hăbet*, témpus secúndumst (*t. ei rei secundas* MSS.).

An incidence of ictus like *perdĕre, disperdĕre* is avoided in Bacchiac (and Cretic) as in the 'dialogue' Metres (§ 1). The first foot of the line or hemistich is, we have seen, the place where these abnormal types occasionally appear, e.g. *perdita* Cist. 686 (just quoted). Hence e.g. *periclum* (*periclum*) could not be replaced by *perícŭlŭm* as a bacchiac foot.

31. The favourite form of Bacchiac line with Plautus is the Tetrameter Acatalectic. The passages quoted in § 26 may serve as illustration of the usual characteristics of this type of verse.

(1) Diaeresis after the second foot is usual but by no means obligatory. (In these passages, for example, there is none in *Amph.* 554, 567, &c.) It may be accompanied by hiatus, though elision is

[redacted]

more usual. There is no example of hiatus in these passages, but we may quote as an instance:

Men. 968 ut ábsente eró rem | erí diligénter.

'Syllaba anceps' is also tolerated at the diaeresis, e.g. *Truc.* 463:

uosmét iam *uidḗtĭs*, ut órnata incédo.

(2) The arsis immediately preceding the diaeresis is rarely resolved. (In the *Amphitruo* passage we seem to find an example of this resolution, v. 570:

perdát. Quid malí sum, *ĕrĕ*, || tua éx re proméritus?)

In other words, a second paeon or ionic a minore is avoided in the second foot, as at the end of the line. (For the possible substitutes for a bacchius and the restrictions of their use see §§ 27—9.)

On the limited part played by the Law of Breves Breviantes in Bacchiac (and Cretic) Verse, see ii. § 34ᵃ.

For details of the Diaeresis of Bacchiac Tetrameters, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 218 sq. He shews that in its absence there is usually a Caesura after the first arsis of the second foot, e.g. *Poen.* 230:

postrémo modús muliebrís nullust númquam;

and that this Caesura is always found (with or without Diaeresis), when the second arsis of the second foot is 'resolved.' Another example of a Tetrameter without Diaeresis is *Cas.* 667:

Insánit. Sceléstissimúm me esse crédo,

where the necessity of bringing the long word into the line has made Diaeresis impossible.

On the rarity of the resolution of the arsis immediately preceding the Diaeresis, see Seyffert, *de Bacch. Vers.*, p. 21, and *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1896, p. 848; and cf. *Bacch.* 1126, *Cas.* 700.

The Catalectic form of the Tetrameter is occasionally found. For instance, at the close of a passage in Acatalectic Tetrameters we have *Poen.* 244:

olént, salsa súnt, tangere út non uelís,

with the last foot, *uĕlĭs*, catalectic.

32. The Bacchiac Dimeter is by no means rare. The first Scene of the second Act of the *Trinummus* begins with nine Bacchiac Tetrameters followed by the Dimeter (v. 232):

ad aétatem agúndam.

The Catalectic form similarly marks the end of a stage in a Bacchiac Tetrameter passage in the *Bacchides* (v. 1137):

solaé liberaé.

The Bacchiac Hexameter is found, e.g. in a passage of the *Amphitruo* (vv. 633 sqq.) beginning:

Satín parua rés est uolúptatum in uíta atque in aétate agúnda?

the Octameter in *Pseud.* 1329:

A. Quid núnc? numquid íratus és aut mihi aút filió propter hás res, Simó? *B.* Nil proféсto.

The Trimeter too (specially attested by Priscian, *de Metris Terentii*, p. 425 K., quoted in § 35) seems to make good its claim to recognition as a Plautine form, e.g. *Amph.* 644:

Absít, dum modó laude párta.

But these varieties are usually the result of a more or less capricious distribution of a 'system' into lines (more properly 'cola') of convenient size for writing or printing on a page (cf. § 5).

33. A common form of Bacchiac line is the 'contracted' or defective Tetrameter (cf. the 'contracted' Cretic, § 38), in which the second arsis of the third foot is wanting, e.g. *Most.* 783—4:

A. Nunc húnc hau scio án conloquár. congrédiar.
Heus Théopropides. *B.* Hém quís hic nóminát me?

In both of these lines the third foot is an incomplete Bacchius, *-lŏquár* and *hīc nó-*.

The lines stand at the beginning of a passage in acatalectic Bacchiac Tetrameters. The same metre marks the conclusion of such a passage, e.g. *Cist.* 4:

Qui mágis potueritis m(i) hŏnórem ire hábitum?

and occurs at various parts of a like passage of the *Casina* (vv. 684 sqq.). (I indicate the contracted feet by italic type):

A. Neque ést neque fuit me senéx quisquam amátor
adaéque misér. *B.* Ludo *ego húnc* facéte;
nam quaé facta dixi omnia huic falsa dixi:
era átque haec dolum éx proxumo húnc protulérunt,
ego húnc missa súm ludere. *A.* Heús Pardalisca.
B. Quid ést? *A.* Est—*B.* Quid? *A.* Ést quod uolo éxquirere éx te.
B. Moram óffers mihi. *A.* At tu mihi óffers maerórem.
(v. 691.)
B. Habét, sed duós. *A.* Quid, duós? *B.* Alteró te
occisurum aít, alteró uilicum hódie.
A. Occisissimús sum om*nium* qui uíuont.
loricam induám mi op*tumum és*se opínor.
(v. 696.)

B. Nemo aúdet prope áccedere. *A.* Éxorēt. *B.* Orat:
negát ponere álio modo úllo profécto,
nisí se sciát uilicó non datum íri.
A. Atque íngratiis, quia non uólt, nubēt hódie.
nam quór non ego íd perpetrém quod cōépi,
ut núbat mihi? íllud *quidém* uolébam,
(v. 703.)
A. Timór praepedít uerba, uérum, obsecró te,
dic méd uxorem órare ut éxorēt íllam.

The contracted lines break the monotony of the passage in much the same fashion as the introduction of syncopated Iambic or Trochaic 'metra' in an Iambic or Trochaic passage of a Greek chorus. But while in these Greek passages this syncope may appear at any part of the line, the 'contracted' Bacchius (usually an Iambus or Tribrach) is limited to one position.

These 'contracted' Tetrameters were formerly regarded as corrupt by editors, who exerted themselves to transform them into normal lines. Thus in the above passage of the *Casina* Schoell prints v. 685 with insertion of *quam*:

adaéque misér. *B.* ludo ego húnc quam facéte,

v. 694 with insertion of *hominum*:

occísissimús sum omnium hóminum qui uíuont,

v. 695 with insertion of *hoc* and transposition of *mi* and *optumum*:

loricam induam: hóc optumúm mi esse opínor,

in spite of the 'consensus' of the Ambrosian Palimpsest and the Palatine MSS. The metre is otherwise explained by those who regard 'hypercatalectic' Iambic lines as a legitimate variety for Plautus (see § 6). They make it a combination of a Bacchiac Dimeter acatalectic (e.g. *occísissimús sum om-*) with an Iambic Monometer 'hypercatalectic' (*-niúm qui ui|uont*).

In the Canticum in the *Andria* (Act IV. Sc. i.) a Cretic passage is followed first by an Iambic couplet, then by a Bacchiac couplet (vv. 637—8).

The option often presents itself of treating a passage either as a Bacchiac (or Cretic) 'system' throughout, or else as Bacchiac in part and Cretic in part. *Pseud.* 1329—30 received the one colometry in the 'Palatine,' the other in the 'Ambrosian' recension (see § 5). Cf. *Pseud.* 1126 sqq.; *Men.* 571 sqq.; Caecilius 151 sqq. R. (quoted in § 2). A fragment of the *Thyestes* of Ennius, quoted by Cicero (*Tusc.* III. xii. 26) seems to be of this nature (303 sqq. R.):

Nolíte, hospités, ad me adíre: ilico ísti:
ne cóntagió mea bonís umbraue óbsit.
tánta uis scéleris in córpore haeret.
Quidnam ést, obsecró? quid te adír(i) abnútas?

34. Bacchiacs are often found in conjunction with Cretics. Thus the Canticum in Act I. Sc. v. of the *Rudens* begins with a Bacchiac passage of 6 lines (vv. 259—264), followed almost immediately by a Cretic passage of 12 lines (vv. 266—277), at the close of which the Bacchiac metre is resumed (vv. 278 sqq.); cf. Act I. Sc. ii. of the *Mostellaria*. (Cf. the change from Iambic to Trochaic metre, § 13.)

Often an Iambic Dimeter interrupts a Bacchiac Tetrameter passage; e.g. in *Most.* I. ii. after six Bacchiac Tetrameters acatalectic comes a catalectic Iambic Dimeter (v. 90):

id répperi iam exémplum,

(cf. v. 102 *factaé probe examússim*; v. 127 *sumptú suo et labóre*). Often an Anapaestic Dimeter plays the same part; e.g. in *Cas.* III. v. we find a Bacchiac passage interrupted by the line (v. 661):

A. Habĕt. *B.* Eí misero mihi, cúr eum habet?

and in *Rud.* IV. ii. four Bacchiac Tetrameters are followed by v. 919:

tolerárem, opera haud fui párcŭs mea.

A Trochaic Tetrameter is another thread that often varies a Bacchiac texture. In the long Bacchiac passage in the *Mercator* quoted in § 26, vv. 341, 855, and 858 are Trochaic Octonarii, while vv. 837 (?), 339 (and 340?) are Anapaestic Dimeters acatalectic. (On the affinity of Bacchiac with Ionic verse, see § 48.)

35. No particular sentiment or situation can be appropriated for the Bacchiac Cantica. In the *Captivi* Hegio uses this metre to express his distress at finding himself outwitted by the captives' stratagem (vv. 781 sqq.):

Quanto ín pectore hánc rem meó magís uolúto,
tantó mi aegritúdo auctiŏr est in ánimo, &c.

A few scenes later, when his son has been restored to him, his joy finds expression in the same metre (vv. 922 sqq.):

Iouí disque agó gratiás merito mágnas,
quom té redducém tuo patrí reddidérunt, &c.

Priscian (*de Metris Terentii*, p. 425 Keil) curiously describes Bacchiac verse as suitable for the remarks of uneducated characters in a play, e.g. the 'obstetrix' in the *Andria* (vv. 481 sqq.), the serving-maid in the *Truculentus* (vv. 95 sqq.), a sailor in a play of Turpilius. The passage is so interesting that I make no apology for quoting the whole of it:

Terentius trochaico mixto vel confuso cum iambico utitur in sermone personarum, quibus maxime imperitior hic conuenit, quem, puto, ut imitetur, hanc confusionem rythmorum facit. sunt autem et trimetri et hoc plus minusque, et habent paenultimam versus syllabam in quibusdam longam, in quibusdam brevem, ut in Andria:

Adhúc, Archilis, quae adsolént quaeque opórtet
signa ésse ad salútem, omnia huic esse uideo.
nunc prímum fac ísta ut lauét, poste deinde
quod iússi darí bibere et quántum imperáui.

Hos sequitur dimeter catalecticus finiendi sermonis causa, quem ad Archilida habuit;

date, móx ego huc reuértar.

Similiter Plautus in Truculento eodem metro usus est in sermone ancillae Astaphii:

> Ad fórēs auscultátē atque ádseruate aédes,
> nequi[s] áduentor gráuiōr abaétat quam aduéniat,
> neu quís manus attúlerit sterilis intrō ád nos,
> grauidás forās expórtet. noui égō hominum móres.

Turpilius in Lindia nautae personam inducit hoc metro loquentem:

> Di[s] aduénientem pérdant: <ita> híquidem nos pérdit,
> festum ésse diem hic quártum hodie iteránt: ita conuéntum.

The Bacchiac character of the two last passages is open to doubt. The metre of Eur. *Ion* 144 sqq. has been suggested as the probable type.

(For fuller details regarding Plautus' Bacchiacs see Seyffert, *de Bacchiacorum Versuum usu Plautino*, Berlin, 1864.)

E. Cretic.

36. The cretic (⏑́ ⏑ ⏑́) may be replaced, as in Greek Verse, by the fourth paeon (⏑́ ⏑ ⏑ –́), or first paeon (–́ ⏑ ⏑́ ⏑). The Latin Dramatists allow also in the first and third feet a molossus (–́ – –́) as a substitute (i.e. they allow an 'irrational' thesis, long instead of short). This 'irrational' thesis however is subject to similar restriction in Cretics as in Bacchiac and other metres (§§ 9, 30). A long syllable, which is at the same time the stressed syllable in pronunciation, is not allowed, except occasionally in the first foot (e.g. *áccēdam* Most. 713); or to state the rule differently, such molossi are avoided as would bring the metrical ictus and the natural accent into too great conflict.

Thus in the following passage, which may serve as a specimen of Plautus' Cretic Tetrameters, we have molossi in the first foot in vv. 233 *cērtō uōx*, 242 *āccēd(e) ād*, 267 *uērūm lōng(e)*, 272 *quaēn(e) ēiēct(ae)*, and in the third foot in vv. 243 *dīc uiuim(e)*, 267 *ūnd(e) āduēct(ae)*, 276 *tēctō sērv-*, but only in the case of one (and that a doubtful case) in the first foot (v. 242 *āccēd(e) ād*) is the 'irrational' long thesis a syllable which would bear the stress in pronunciation. In v. 233 we have an 'irrational' thesis in a less frequent substitute, viz. an ionic a majore (–́ – ⏑́ ⏑), *aūris tēti-*; and here too the long thesis is an unaccented syllable.

Rud. 233 sqq.:

> *A.* Cérto uox múliebrīs aúris tetigit meas.
> *B.* Múlier est, múliebris uóx mi ad auris uēnit.
> num Ámpelisca óbsecro est? *A.* Tén, Palaestra, aúdio?
> *B.* Quín uoco, ut me aúdiat, nómine illám suo?
> Ámpelisca. *A.* Hém quis est? *B.* Égō, Palaestra, <écce me>.
> *A.* Dic ubi es? *B.* Pól egō nunc in malis plúrimis.
> *A.* Sócia sum, néc minor párs meast quám tua.
> séd uidere éxpeto té. *B.* Mihi ēs aémula.

A. Cónsequamúr gradu uócem. ubi ĕs? *B*. Écce me.
áccede ad me átque adi cóntrā. *A*. Fit sédulo.
B. Cédo manūm. *A*. Áccipĕ. *B*. Dic uiuisne? óbsecro.
A. Tú facis mé quidem uíuere ut núnc uelim,
quóm mihi té licet tángere. ut uix mihi
crédo ego hoc, té tenere. óbsecro, ampléctere,
spés mea. ut me ómnium iám laborúm leuas.
B. Óccupas praéloqui quaé mea orátiost.
núnc abire hinc decet nós. *A*. Quo, amabo, íbimus?
B. Lítus hoc pérsequamúr. *A*. Sequor quó lubet.
sícine hic cum úuida uéste grassábimur?
B. Hóc quod est, id necessárium est pérpeti. 252
(vv. 253—265.)
A. Ílico hinc ímus, haud lóngule ex hóc loco; 266
uérum longe hinc abest únde aduectae húc sumus.
B. Némpe equo lígneo pér uias caérulas
éstis uectae? *A*. Ádmodum. *B*. Ergo aéquius uós erat
cándidatás uenire hóstiatásque. ad hoc
fánum ad istúnc modum nón ueniri solet.
A. Quaéne eiectae é mari símus ambae, óbsecro,
únde nos hóstias ágere uoluístī huc?
núnc tibi ampléctimur génua egentés opum,
quae in locis nésciis néscia spé sumus,
út tuo récipias técto seruésque nos
míseriarúmque te ambárum uti mísereat.

The same lines furnish us with examples of the fourth paeon in vv. 233 *mŭlĭĕbrīs*, 234 *mŭlĭĕr ĕst*, *mŭlĭĕbrīs*, 237 *ĕgŏ Pălāes-*, 243 *cĕdŏ mănūm*, 274 *gĕnŭ(a) ĕgĕnt-*, 276 *rĕcĭpĭās*, 277 *mĭsĕrĭā-*, *mĭsĕrĕāt*. In v. 278 we have the rare resolution of both long arses (⏑́⏑⏑⏑́⏑), *ăgĕrĕ uŏlŭ-*, if the reading be right. Similarly in *Most*. 719 *Quíd ăgĭs? Hŏmĭn(em)* óptumum téneo. Amicé facis; Accius 239 R. *ágĭtĕ mŏdĭcó* gradu! iácite thyrsós leues (cf. 301 R.).

The Choriambus (⏑́⏑⏑⏑́) seems to obtrude occasionally, e.g.:

> *Truc*. 599 *Íllicinest?* Íllic est. Me íntuetúr gemens.
> *Most*. 704 Néminem *sóllicitat* ‖ sopor. ibi omnibus.

(Cf. *Epid*. 29, 98, *Bacch*. 656, *Truc*. 624.) Lines like *Capt*. 207, *Cist*. 691, *Pseud*. 1249 are scanned by Leo as Cretics with an Ithyphallic colon (§ 52):

> át fugam fíngitis ‖ sentio quam rem agitis.
> quaé neque illa illi quicqu(am) ‖ usui et mi exitio est.
> nam hércle si cécidero ‖ uestrum erit flagitium.

On the avoidance in Latin Cretics (and other metres) of an ictus like *trahére*, *detrahére*, see §§ 1, 30. This disqualifies, e.g. *sollicitūs* from playing the part of a cretic foot (*sóllicĭtūs*).

37. The chief rules of the Cretic Tetrameter Acatalectic, the favourite form of Cretic verse in Plautus, are these. Diaeresis, though usual, is not necessary. Thus in the *Rudens* passage we have none in vv. 250, 252, 277 ('latent' in v. 270). Both Hiatus

(ii. § 37) and Syllaba Anceps (e.g. v. 233) are allowed at the Diaeresis.

For fuller details regarding the Diaeresis of the Cretic Tetrameter, see Klotz, *Grundzüge*, pp. 220 sqq. He shews that it is dispensed with when a long word could not otherwise be brought into the line, e.g. *Pseud.* 1303 :

Mássici móntis ubérrumos quáttuor.

Terence has a passage in Cretic Tetrameters in the *Andria* (vv. 626 sqq.).

The Trimeter is rare It occurs, e.g. in *Pseud.* 1119, at the end of a Tetrameter passage :

uérum ubi is nón uĕnit néc uocat.

(Cf. *Cas.* 150.) The Dimeter is not so rare, e.g. *Pseud.* 1108 *séruitutis ferunt.* In the *Persa*, if we follow the arrangement of the Ambrosian Palimpsest, we have a Dimeter with two Monometers, at vv. 17 sqq. :

A. Út uales?
B. Út queo. *A.* Quíd agitur?
B. Viuitur;

and in the *Epidicus* pairs of Monometers (written by some editors as Dimeters) alternating with Trochaic Septenarii at vv. 85 sqq. :

Néque egŏ nunc
quómodo
me éxpeditum ex ímpedito fáciam, consiliúm placet.
égŏ miser
pérpuli
méis dolis senem, út censeret súam sese emere filiam :
ís suo
filio
fidicinam emit, quấm ípse amat, quam ábiens mandauít mihi, &c.

But the recognition of these varieties is generally more or less arbitrary, for they depend on the method followed in breaking up a 'system' into its separate lines (or rather 'cola') (see § 5). The same is true of the 'hypermetric' Cretic Verse which appears now and then in conjunction with Bacchiacs, e.g. *Men.* 573, Ennius *Trag.* 305 R. (quoted in § 33). Other lines sometimes scanned as 'hypermetric' Cretics may be regarded as Cretics with a Trochaic colon, e.g. *Capt.* 215 *séd breuem orátion(em)* || *íncipisse* (cf. Leo, *Plaut. Cant.* pp. 17 sq.).

38. A common type is the 'contracted' or defective Tetrameter in which the second arsis of the third foot is wanting (cf. the 'contracted' Bacchiac, § 33), e.g. *Most.* 691 :

néc quod una ésca me iúuerít magis.

The thesis of the 'contracted' foot is usually 'pure' (i.e. a short syllable); but cf. *Most.* 108 *témpĕstás uenit.*

A not infrequent variety departs from this in much the same way as the 'miuric' variety (ending – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏓) from the ordinary

Dactylic Hexameter (ending – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏓), and substitutes a short syllable for the first arsis of the last Cretic, e.g. *Most.* 706:

éxsequi cérta res ést ut abeam.

In the Second Scene of the *Mostellaria* we have a long passage in 'contracted' Cretic Tetrameters, partly of the first type, partly (indicated by italics) of the second (vv. 690 sqq.):

A. Mélius anno hóc mihi nón fuít domi,
néc quod una ésca me iúuerit magis.
prándium uxór mihi pérbonúm dedit,
núnc dormitúm iubet *me íre: minime.*
nón mihi fórte uisum ílicó fuit,
méliŭs quom prándium quám solét dedit:
uóluīt in cúbiculum ab*dúcere me anus.*
nón bonust sómnŭs de *prándio. apage.*
clánculum ex aédibus me édidí foras.
tóta turgét mihi uxór, sció, domi.
B. Rés parata ést male in uésperum huic seni.
nam ét cenandum ét cubandúmst eí male.
A. Qŭóm magis cógito *cŭm meo animo:*
sí quis dotátam uxorem *átque anŭm habet,* &c.

The Dimeter of the first type (which some make a Dochmius; cf. Leo, *Plaut. Cant.* p. 20) is quoted by Rufinus (p. 556, 10 K.) from Caecilius as a specimen of a 'clausula':

dí boní, quid hoc?

and seems to recur in Liv. Andr. 20, 22 R.:

dá mihi hásce opes
(quás peto, quás precor)
pórrige, ópitula.

The 'Dimeter' of the second type seems to shew itself in *Truc.* 120—1:

Pessuma, mane.
Optuma, odio es.

It is the 'pes thymelicus' of Diomede (p. 281 K.): pes thymelicus ex longa et tribus brevibus et longa, temporum octo (cf. Priscian ii. p. 422, 19 K.).

39. Cretic Verse is often associated with Trochaic in the Greek Drama, and the association persists in Roman Cantica. The passage of the *Epidicus*, quoted in § 37, may serve as example (cf. the remark in the same paragraph on the addition of Trochaic cola to Cretics). A Cretic passage is not infrequently found in the neighbourhood of a Bacchiac passage (see § 34). The close connexion of (1) Glyconics, (2) Choriambics with Cretics, is stated in §§ 42, 45. (On the relation of Dactylics to Cretics see § 47.)

An example from Ennius of the association of Cretics with Trochaics is the famous threnody in the *Andromacha Aechmalotis* (75 sqq. R.):

quíd petam praésidi aut éxsequar? quóue nunc
aúxilio(?) éxili | aút fugae fréta sim?
árce et urbe órba sum. qu(o) áccedam? qu(o) ápplicem?
cuí nec arae pátriae domí stant, fráctae et disiectaé iacent,
fána flamma déflagrata, tósti alti stant párietes.

40. To assign a particular ethos to the Cretic Cantica of Plautus is impossible. Their use in the expression of grief and despair is indeed unmistakable. For example, two Cretic passages in the *Rudens* closely correspond to the threnody (just quoted) of Ennius, *Rud.* 213 sqq.:

hác an illác eam, incérta sum cónsili;
néc prope usquam híc quidem cúltum agrum cónspicor.
álgōr, errór, pauor, || m(e) omnia tenent, &c.

Rud. 664 sqq.:

núnc id est cum ómnium cópiarum átque opum,
aúxili, praésidi uíduitas nós tenet, &c.

Cf. *Rud.* 233 sqq., quoted in § 36, and the pretty serenade in the *Curculio* (vv. 148 sqq.):

péssuli, heus péssuli, uós salutó lubens,
uós amo, uós uolo, uós peto atque óbsecro,
gérite amanti mihi mórem, amoenissumi,
fite causá mea lúdii bárbari,
sússilite, óbsecro, et mittite istánc foras,
quaé mihi misero amanti ébibit sánguinem.
hóc uide ut dórmiunt péssuli péssumi,
néc mea grátia cómmouent se ócius.

On the other hand the complacent tone of Simo's soliloquy in the *Mostellaria* (quoted in § 38) is in the strongest contrast to these 'molles querelae.' So is the vigorous battle-piece in the *Amphitruo* (vv. 219 sqq.), e.g. 238—241:

séd fugam in sé tamen némo conuórtitur,
néc recedít loco quín statim rém gerat;
ánimam amittúnt prius quám loco démigrent:
quísque ut steterát iacĕt óbtinetque órdinem.

(For fuller details regarding Plautus' Cretics see Spengel, *Reformvorschläge zur Metrik der Lyrischen Versarten bei Plautus*, pp. 1 sqq.)

F. Glyconics, &c.

41. The usual type of Glyconic Verse (e.g. Hor. *Sic te diva potens Cypri*) in the Greek Drama is – ⏒ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑̽, and of Pherecratean (or catalectic Glyconic) – ⏒ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑̽. But there are many variations, the commonest being – ⏒ – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑̽, with interchange of 'dactyl' and 'trochee.' In Plautus we find a corresponding variety of forms. Thus in a Glyconic passage in the *Bacchides* (vv. 989 sqq.):

A. Ut scias quaĕ hīc scripta sient. 989
B. Nil moror neque scire uolo. 989a
A. Tamen ades. *B.* Quid opust? *A.* Taceas: 990
quod iubeo id facias. *B.* Adero, 990a

the prevailing form is – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –, but v. 990 begins with ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ instead of – ⏑, and v. 990[a] with – ⏑ ⏑. Of the Versus Priapeus, composed of a Glyconic and a Pherecratean (e.g. Catull. *Hunc lucum tibi dedico* || *consecroque, Priape*), we seem to have an example at the beginning of the mock-marriage-hymn in the *Casina*, v. 815:

sensim super ăttolle li||men pedes, noua nupta (*mea no. nu.* A).

– – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ – ⏑ – || – ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏓

A Glyconic is sometimes followed by a Dochmiac colon (see § 44).

42. The last line of the above passage of the *Bacchides* might be described as a Catalectic Dactylic Tetrameter (–́ ⏑ ⏑ –́ ⏑ ⏑ –́ ⏑ ⏑ ⏓) rather than as a Glyconic with a 'dactyl' substituted for the 'trochee' of the Glyconic. The opening of the third Scene of the fifth Act of the *Casina* presents a similar difficulty (vv. 937 sqq.):

maxumo ego ardeŏ flagitio
nec quid agam meĭs rebŭs scio,
nec meam ut uxorem aspiciam:
<om>nia palam sunt probra,

where the dactylic type (– ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏓) is exhibited by all the lines except the last (– ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – – ⏑ ⏓). (The reading of this line is by no means certain.)

In these two passages the presence of a line (or lines) of distinctively Glyconic type enables us to claim the form – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – as a mere variety of the Glyconic. But other passages, where all lines without exception shew this Dactylic form, leave room for doubt. Some editors find Catalectic Dactylic Tetrameters and not Glyconics in passages like *Men.* 114:

nam quotiens forăs ire uolo, || me retines, reuocas, rogitas,

Bacch. 626—627[a]:

Mnesilochĕ, quid fit? Perii.
Di melius faciant. Perii.
Non tacĕs, insipiens? Taceam?
Sanŭs satis non es. Perii.

They are found in the neighbourhood of Cretics.

Similarly in *Epid.* 166 sqq. the two Cretic couplets are each followed by one line, which can be regarded as Dactylic, as well as Dochmiac:

168 quom usust ut pudeat (usus est *Leo*).
170[a] ducere te uxorem.

A chorus of Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 1450 sqq.) suggests another designation, viz. 'Choriambo-Trochaic' (cf. Christ, *Metrik*[2], pp. 473 sqq.). Aristophanes begins with 'Choriambo-Iambics' (see § 46), then passes into this metre (vv. 1457 sqq.):

τὸ γὰρ ἀποστῆναι χαλεπὸν
φύσεος, ἣν ἔχοι τις ἀεί.
καίτοι πολλοὶ ταῦτ' ἔπαθον·
ξυνόντες γνώμαις ἑτέρων
μετεβάλλοντο τοὺς τρόπους,

with which we may compare *Cas.* 937 sqq. and *Bacch.* 626 sqq. (both quoted above), but especially passages like *Bacch.* 628 sqq., *Epid.* 533 sqq. (with v. 537 Choriambic, v. 538 Cretic), e.g. *Bacch.* 630 sqq.:

Heia, bonum habe animum. Unde habeam?
Mortuūs plurīs pretiist quam ego sum.
Militis parasitūs modo
Venerāt aurum petere hinc.
Eum ego meis dictis malis, &c.

The 'Metrum Eupolideum' (§ 2), e.g. Aristoph. *Nub.* 518 sqq., is 'Choriambo-Trochaic.'

G. Dochmii.

43. The Dochmius, whose two normal types ⏑́ ⏑⏑ ⏑́ ⏑ – (e.g. Aristoph. *Plut.* 640 μέγα βροτοῖσι φέγ||γος Ἀσκλήπιον) and ⏑́ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑́ ⏑ – (e.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 219 μήποτ' ἐμὸν κατ' αἰ||ῶνα λίποι θεῶν) admit of many variations, is by some editors refused a place in Plautus' writings, on the ground of its being preeminently a tragic metre. But it plays a great part in Greek Comedy too. And we seem to have a clear instance of Dochmii at the opening of the *Stichus* (vv. 1—3ᵃ):

crédo egó miseram
fuisse Pénelopam, 1ᵃ
sóror, s(uō) éx animo (cf. ii. § 15),
quaé tam diū uidua 2ᵃ
uíro suō caruit.
nám nos eí(u)s animum. 3ᵃ

(Three Versus Reiziani follow.) These lines appear all to follow the type ⏑́ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ –. (On the recently discovered Greek Monody, mainly Dochmiac, of the Alexandrian stage, see § 2.)

44. Dochmii are usually associated with Glyconics; for example in these passages (I bracket the Glyconic cola), *Rud.* 952—3:

A. (Si fidem modo das mihi te) || nón fore ínfidum.
B. (Do fidem tibi; fidus ero,) || quísquis és. *A.* Audi,

Adelph. 613 quómodó me ex hac || éxpediám turba.
(tanta nunc suspiciō de || me incidit, neque ea immerito.)

This is a Greek practice, e.g. Aesch. *Sept.* 221—2:

ἀστυδρομουμέναν || πόλιν καὶ στράτευμ'
(ἁπτόμενον πυρὶ δαΐῳ).

Eur. *Phoen.* 108—110: *(ἰὼ πότνια παῖ Λατοῦς)*
(Ἑκάτα, κατάχαλκον ἅπαν)
πεδίον ἀστράπτει.

H. Choriambics.

45. The Choriambic lines of Plautus are closely associated with Cretics (and therefore with Glyconics, which are a common adjunct of Cretics, § 42). For example, the Canticum in Cretic Tetrameters in *Asin.* I. ii. is at v. 134 interrupted by a Choriambic Tetrameter:

perlecebrae, | permities, | adulescentum | exitium,

(with substitution of ⏑⏑–– for –⏑⏑– in the third foot); the Canticum in *Men.* I. ii. begins with a Choriambic Tetrameter (v. 110):

ni mala, ni | stulta sies, | ni indomita im|posque animi,

but the greater part of the following lines are Cretic Tetrameters; in *Cas.* III. v. a Cretic passage is followed by the Choriambic line (v. 629):

eripite is|ti gladium, | quae suĭst im|pŏs animi.

(Cf. *Bacch.* 651, *Epid.* 537.)

The association of Choriambics with Glyconics is a feature of the Greek Drama. Thus in Aristoph. *Thesm.* 357 sqq. we have a Choriambic line followed by a number of Glyconics:

ἐξαπατῶσιν παραβαίνουσί τε τοὺς
ὅρκους τοὺς νενομισμένους
κερδῶν εἵνεκ' ἐπὶ βλάβῃ, etc.

46. The Choriambo-Iambics of the Greek Drama, e.g. Aristoph. *Acharn.* 1150 sqq.:

Ἀντίμαχον τὸν Ψακάδος τὸν ξυγγραφῆ, τὸν μελέων ποιητήν,
ὡς μὲν ἁπλῷ λόγῳ κακῶς ἐξολέσειεν ὁ Ζεύς·
ὅς γ' ἐμὲ τὸν τλήμονα Λήναια χορηγῶν ἀπέλυσ' ἄδειπνον,

are reproduced in one of the few lyric Cantica of Terence (*Ad.* 612 sqq.). (I print the normal Iambic 'metra' in italics):

ut neque quid me faciam nec quid agam *certum siet.*
membra metu *debilia sunt*
animus timore obstipuit, &c.

Terence associates them with Glyconics. Thus v. 614 is a Glyconic couplet, and the following line (the last of the lyric passage) is Choriambic (ending in a spondee):

tanta nunc suspiciŏ de || me incidit, neque ea immerito.
Sostrata cre|dit mihi me | psaltriam hănc e|misse: id anus | mi indicium | fecit.

On the equivalence of the Choriambus in this Greek usage to an 'anaclastic' Iambic metrum (–⏑⏑– for ⏓–⏑–) see § 4. On 'Choriambo-Trochaics' see § 42.

I. Dactylic.

47. We have already considered the difficulty of distinguishing between Dactylic Verse and (1) Glyconics (§ 42), (2) Anapaestic Verse (§ 21). So difficult indeed is it to assign definitely to Dactylic Metre any line of Plautus that the discussion of the laws of this metre seems out of place. It is however worth mention that we might expect to find the Proceleusmatic (⏑́⏑⏑⏑) and Anapaest (⏑́⏑–) as permissible substitutes for the Dactyl, since they seem to be occasionally substituted in the earlier Latin Dactylic poetry, e.g. Enn. *Ann.* 267 M.:

Căpĭtĭbŭ' nutantis pinos rectosque cupressos,

C. I. L. i. 542 (Tit. Mumm.):

Cogendei dissoluendei tu ut făcĭlĭă faxseis,

Enn. *Sat.* 53 M.:

Mytĭlēnaest pecten charadrusque apud Ambraciai || Finis,

Enn. *ibid.* 59:

mĕlănūrum, turdum, merulamque umbramque marinam.

(See Reichardt in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*, 1889, p. 785.)

On the existence of the 'versus Diphilius'

(–́⏑⏑–́⏑⏑–́⏓–́⏑⏑–́⏑⏑–,

e.g. Aristoph. *Pax* 775 Μοῦσα, *σὺ μὲν πολέμους ἀπωσαμένη μετ' ἐμοῦ*) in Plautus (*Curc.* 96—7, *Cas.* 644) see § 3.

In the Canticum of Act IV. Sc. i. of the *Andria* Terence introduces a Cretic passage by a single Dactylic line (v. 625):

hoccinĕst credibile aut memorabile?

In the fragments of the Tragedians we find more examples of Dactylic Verse, for example, Cassandra's prophecy in the *Alexander* of Ennius (50 sqq. R.):

iamque mari magno classis cita
texitur: exitium examen rapit:
adueniet, fera ueliuolantibus
nauibŭs complebit manŭs litora,

(cf. v. 251 R., *Praet.* 4 R.), and in the *Antigona* of Accius (140—1 R.):

heus, uigiles, properate, expergite
pectora tarda sopore, exsurgite!

Some would reckon as Dactylic all Anapaestic passages in which dactyls shew a majority, e.g. *Trin.* 239:

blandiloquentulus, harpago, mendax,

and there is a temptation to ascribe intermixture of Dactylics and Anapaestics (in the manner of Cretics and Bacchiacs, § 34) to passages like *Pseud.* 595—601, *Trin.* IV. i.

J. Ionic.

48. Of the two varieties of Ionic foot, the Ionic 'a majore' (–́ –́ ⏑ ⏑), and Ionic 'a minore' (⏑ ⏑ –́ –́), the latter is best known to us in Latin poetry from Horace's ode (*C.* III. xii.) beginning:

Miserarum est neque amori dare ludum neque dulci
mala uino lauere aut exanimari metuentes
patruae uerbera linguae;

of the former the most familiar variety is the Sotadic Verse, which exhibits that modification of one or more feet which is technically known as 'anaclasis' (–́ ⏑ –́ ⏑ instead of –́ –́ ⏑ ⏑), and ends the line with – ⏓. Of this Sotadic Verse we have an example, the earliest known in Latin literature[1], in the *Amphitruo*, vv. 168 sqq. (the 'anaclastic' feet are indicated by Italics):

noctesque di|esque assidu|*o satis su*|perque est
quod facto aut | dicto adeost | *opŭs quietŭs* | ne sis.
ipse dominŭs | diuēs ope|*ris,* [*et*] *laboris* | expers,
quodcumque homi|*ni accidit lĭ*|*bĕrĕ, posse* | retur:
aequom esse pu|tat, non repu|*tat laborĭs* | quid sit.

Here we have examples of various substitutes allowed for the pure Ionic foot, viz. the Choriambus (– ⏑ ⏑ –) in v. 169 *dicto adeost,* the Molossus (– – –) in v. 169 *quod facto aut,* and of the forms with resolution of long arsis, we have in v. 170 – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ *ipse dominus,*

[1] If it is older than the *Sota* of Ennius, of which one or two lines have been preserved, e.g. 65 M.:

ille ictu' re|tro reccidit | *in natem su*|pinus.

A line preserved from the *Inimici* of Afranius gives us another example of the Ionic a Majore or Versus Sotadeus without 'anaclasis' (202 R.):

multa atque mo|lesta es: potin | ut dicta fa|cessas?

and in 169 ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ (anaclastic) *opus quietus*. We have another certain Ionic passage in the penultimate Scene of the *Pseudolus*, e.g. v. 1275:

probe Ionica | perdidici | sed pallio|*latim amictus*,

though the text of the neighbouring lines is unfortunately not free from uncertainty.

In the Greek Drama the Bacchiac is associated with the Ionic rhythm. Thus the hymn of the Mystae in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes begins (v. 324):

Ἴακχ' ὦ | πολυτιμή|τοις ἕδραις ἐν|θάδε ναίων,

with the first foot a Bacchius (⏑ –́ –́). Similarly in Plautus the Sotadic passage just quoted from the *Amphitruo* is followed by Bacchiac Tetrameters, and the *Pseudolus* passage has Bacchiacs in close proximity.

K. Colon Reizianum, Versus Reizianus.

49. The Colon Reizianum, of which there are several types, (1) ⏒ – ⏑ – ⏓, (2) ⏒ – ⏑ ⏑ – ⏒, (3) ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏒, &c., appears in Aristophanes as the catalectic form of an acephalous Glyconic. Thus in the *Knights*, vv. 1141—4, we have three 'acephalous' Glyconics (i.e. Glyconics wanting the first syllable) followed by the Colon Reizianum:

σκέψασθε δέ μ' εἰ σοφῶς
αὐτοὺς περιέρχομαι
τοὺς οἰομένους φρονεῖν
καί μ' ἐξαπατύλλειν,

and similarly *Eccl.* 291—3:

ἀλλ', ὦ Χαριτιμίδη
καὶ Σμίκυθε καὶ Δράκης
ἕπου κατεπείγων.

It follows an Iambic Dimeter in such passages as *Ach.* 840:

ἢ συκοφάντης ἄλλος, οἰ||μώζων καθεδεῖται,

and *Pax* 954:

φυσῶντι καὶ πονουμένῳ || προσδώσετε δή που.

This composite line (Iambic Dimeter with Colon Reizianum), called the Versus Reizianus, is not infrequent in Plautus. In contrast to

its isolated occurrences in Aristophanes, we find a long passage in this metre in the *Aulularia*, vv. 415 sqq.:

A. Redī, quó fugis nunc? ténŏ, tene. ‖ *B.* Quid, stolide, clamas?
A. Quia ăd trís uiros iam ego déferam ‖ nomen tuom. *B.* Quam ob rem?
A. Quia cúltrum habes. *B.* Cocúm decet. ‖ *A.* Quid comminatu's?
mihi? *B.* Ístuc male factum árbitror, ‖ quia non latŭs fodi.
A. Homŏ núllust te sceléstior ‖ qui uiuăt hodie,
neque quoí ego [de] industria ámplius ‖ male plus libĕns faxim.
B. Pol ĕtsí taceas, palam íd quidem est: ‖ res ipsa testest;
ita fústibus sum móllior ‖ magīs quam ullŭs cinaedus.
sed quíd tibī nos táctiost, ‖ mendice homŏ? *A.* Quae res?
etiám rogitas? an quía minus ‖ quăm aequom erăt feci?
B. Sine, at hércle cum magnó malo ‖ tuo, si hoc capŭt sentit.
A. Pol ego haúd scio quid póst fuat: ‖ tuom nunc capŭt sentit.
sed in aédibus quid tibi meis ‖ năm erat negoti,
me absénte, nisi ego iússeram? ‖ uolŏ scire. *B.* Tace ergo.
quia uénimŭs coctum ad núptias. ‖ *A.* Quid tu, malŭm, curas,
utrúm crudum an coctum égŏ edim, ‖ nisi tu mi es tutor?
B. Volŏ scíre, sinăs an nón sinas ‖ nos coquere hic cenam?
A. Volŏ scire egŏ item, meaé domi ‖ mean salua futura?
B. Vtinám mea mi modo aúferam, ‖ quaĕ ad <te> tulī, salua:
me haud paénitet, tua ne éxpetam. ‖ *A.* Sciŏ, ne docĕ, noui.
B. Quid ĕst quá prohibes nunc grátia ‖ nos coquere hic cenam?
quid fécimus, quid díximus ‖ tibi secŭs quam uelles?
A. Etiám rogitas, sceléste homo, ‖ qui angulŏs in omnis
meārum aédium et concláuium ‖ mihi peruiŭm facitis?
ibi ubí tibi erat negótium, ad ‖ focum sī adesses,
non fissile auferrés caput: ‖ merito id tibi factum est.
adeo út tu meăm senténtiam ‖ iam noscere possis:
si ad iánuam huc accésseris, ‖ nisi iusserŏ, propius,
ego té faciam misérrimus ‖ mortalis uti sis.
scis iám meam senténtiam. ‖ *B.* Quŏ abis? redī rursum.
ita mé bene amet Lauérna, te ‖ <iam> iam, nisi reddi
mihi uása iubĕs, te pípulo ‖ hic differam ănte aedis.

This passage affords examples of the following forms of the chamaeleon-like colon:

(1) – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – – in vv. 415, 437.
(2) – – ⏑ ⏑ – – in vv. 416, 423, 425 (?), 429, 441, 443, 445, 446.
(3) – – ⏑ – – in vv. 417, 421.
(4) ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ – – in vv. 418, 420, 422, 426 (?), 428, 432, 433 (?), 434, 440, 444.
(5) – – – ⏑ ⏑ – in v. 419.
(6) ⏑ – – ⏑ – – in vv. 424 (?), 439.
(7) ⏑ ⏑ – ⏑ – – in v. 427 (?).
(8) ⏑ ⏑ – – – – in v. 430 (?).
(9) – ⏑ ⏑ – – – in vv. 431, 435.
(10) ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ – – – in v. 436.
(11) ⏓⏓ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏓ in vv. 438, 442.

Among the fragments of Afranius we seem to find the Versus Reizianus in v. 203 R. (cf. v. 228 R.).

[redacted]

50. We find the same colon less frequently appended to an Anapaestic Dimeter Acatalectic, e.g. *Bacch.* 670:

non plácet nec temere est étiam. quin || mihi respondetis?

It precedes the Anapaestic Dimeter in Aristoph. *Av.* 1380:

σὺ δὲ τὰ πτερὰ πρῶτον
διάθες τάδε κόσμῳ·
τά τε μουσίχ' ὁμοῦ τά τε μαντικὰ καί, &c.

It is often used in more independent fashion. The Canticum in the sixth Scene of the fourth Act of the *Casina* ends with a passage in Cola Reiziana (vv. 752 sqq.):

A. Sciŏ. sic sine habere;
nugas agŭnt: noui
ego illas malăs merces.
quin tu i modŏ mecum
domum. *B.* Ăt pol malŭm metuo.
(Versus Reizianus.)
A. Tam mihi mea uita
quam tua tibi carast.
(Versus Reizianus.)

The difficulty of distinguishing between a 'contracted' Bacchiac Dimeter (⏑ –́ || ⏑ –́ –́) and a Colon Reizianum has already been mentioned (§ 29).

51. The conjunction of acephalous Glyconics with the Colon Reizianum, of which examples are quoted above from the *Equites* and *Ecclesiazusae*, seems to be reflected, somewhat imperfectly, in a part of the opening Canticum of the *Stichus* (vv. 11 sqq.):

spero quidem et uolo; || sed hoc, sorŏr, crucior,
patrem tuom meumque || adeo, unicĕ qui unus
ciuibus ex omnibus || probūs perhibetur,
eum nunc improbi || uiri officio uti,

where it is not unnatural to suppose that acephalous Glyconics of Plautus' Greek model have been treated by him as Iambic Tripodies.

L. Colon Ithyphallicum and other Cola.

52. A colon of less frequent occurrence than the Reizianum in the Cantica of Plautus is the Ithyphallic (– ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏓). It is a not uncommon ending of a passage in Cretic metre, e.g. *Curc.* 121ᵃ:

A. iam bibes. *B.* Diu fit,

Rud. 253 (where it is preceded by a Cretic Dimeter):

(*A.* Sed quid hoc, obsecro, est?) || *B.* Quid? *A.* Vidēn, amabo?

Cf. Pomponius 165 R.:

(Blánda, fallax, superba) || inpotens, discordia.

The substitution of a 'tribrach' for a 'trochee' is of course permissible. A 'spondee' seems to be substituted in *Cas.* 888:

Sau*ium* *me* siuit.

For a fuller account of the Cola (better κωλάρια or 'clausulae') used by Plautus I refer to Leo's *Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik*, and content myself with quoting the statement of Marius Victorinus (79. 1 K.): *quod vero ad clausulas, i.e. minuscula cola, pertinet, quot genera versuum sunt, totidem eorum membra pro clausulis poni possunt et solent in canticis magis quam deverbiis ...collocari, et praecipue apud Plautum et Naevium et Afranium. nam hi maxime ex omnibus [membris] versuum colis ab his separatis licenter usi reperiuntur in clausulis.*

Of a κωλάριον at the beginning of a passage we may take the example quoted by Varro (ap. Rufin. p. 556 K.), viz. Ter. *Ad.* 610:

discrucior animi
hocine de improuiso mali mihi obici tantum, &c.

[redacted]

T. MACCI PLAVTI

CAPTIVI

THE PLAY.

Nothing is known of the origin of the *Captivi*, a Comedy pronounced by the youthful enthusiasm of Lessing to be 'the finest piece ever put upon the stage[1].' And yet our curiosity is strongly stirred by the singular features of this drama, which claims a place for itself apart from and above all the other dramas of the New or Middle Comedy that are known to us. Can it have been the one dramatic venture of some cultured Athenian, who in a happy moment conceived the idea of purifying and spiritualizing the stock characters and incidents of the Comedy of his time? Or is its isolation due merely to the loss of all the other productions of its author? The tyrannical father, outwitted by intrigue (*comicus stultus senex*), is here replaced by a wonderfully attractive type of the γέρων εὔκολος, as full of 'bonhomie' as Periplectomenus in the *Miles Gloriosus*, but of far greater depth of character and width of sympathy, who reproves more in sorrow than in anger, and never for a moment loses our sincere respect and hearty good-will. In Philocrates and Philopolemus we have an agreeable change from the hackneyed type of profligate son (*amans ephebus*), selfishly intent on his own vicious or, at best, thoughtless schemes; while the cunning slave (*servulus callidus*) receives a veritable apotheosis in the part of Tyndarus, the real hero of the drama, with his noble self-sacrifice for the sake of his master, and his gay, gallant bearing under the worst reverses of fortune. Even the Parasite is toned down to a harmony with the rest of the picture. His hunger and his flattery always amuse, never revolt us, and cannot be said to pass the bounds of reason until the climax of the play is reached, when we ourselves are so transported with the enthusiasm of the moment as to pass without protest into his extravagant mood. The moving passion of the play is not, as of other plays, the passion of love, generally (though the *Trinummus* forms an exception) dishonourable love; it is the chivalrous devotion of a servant to his master: and it is this change of motive which transforms the whole tone of the drama.

[1] 'Die Gefangenen sind das schönste Stück, das jemals auf die Bühne gekommen ist, und zwar aus keiner anderen Ursache, als weil es der Absicht der Lustspiele am nächsten kommt und auch mit den übrigen zufälligen Schönheiten reichlich versehen ist.' *Kritik über die Gefangenen des Plautus.*

The singularity of the play, its utter difference from the ordinary entertainment of a holiday, is expressly acknowledged in the Prologue (vv. 54 sqq.):

> profecto expediet fabulae huic operam dare:
> non pertractate facta est neque item ut ceterae,
> neque spurcidici insunt uersus inmemorabiles:
> hic neque periurus leno est nec meretrix mala, &c.;

and in the Epilogue (vv. 1029 sqq.):

> spectatores, ad pudicos mores facta haec fabula est,...
> huiusmodi paucas poetae reperiunt comoedias,
> ubi boni meliores fiant. nunc uos, si uobis placet,
> et si placuimus neque odio fuimus, signum hoc mittite,
> qui pudicitiae esse uoltis praemium: plausum date.

That the new venture was not found too insipid for the taste of a Roman audience we may infer from the traces of a later revival of the piece (see note on v. 1022). In modern times it has found imitators[1], the best known being Ariosto in his *Suppositi*, and Calderon in his *Principe Constante*.

To its Greek original we can get no clue whatever. The various hypotheses that have been put forward are so unsupported by evidence as hardly to deserve mention[2], and the discovery of a Greek papyrus-fragment in Egypt may at any moment give us sure knowledge in the room of vague surmise. We are equally destitute of information about the relation of the Latin play to its original: whether the Latin text reproduces the Greek with exactness, or whether other plays were drawn upon for materials, we cannot say[3].

Of the date of the Latin adaptation we have more satisfactory indications in the jokes in vv. 90, 888, which suggest the year 193 B.C. (see the notes to these lines); for allusions like these may fairly be supposed to furnish something more than a mere 'terminus a quo' for dating. The facts referred to must have been contemporary, not removed by a lapse of time; otherwise the allusions would lack point. The *Captivi* thus belonged to the latter part of Plautus' literary activity, if we are right in believing this to have extended from about 204 B.C., the probable date of the *Miles Gloriosus*, to the death of the poet in 184 B.C. (The action of the piece is described in the preliminary notes to the several Acts and Scenes.)

[1] For a list of others see Reinhardstoettner, *Spätere Bearbeitungen Plautinischer Lustspiele*, Leipz. 1886.
[2] See Hueffner, *de Plauti comoediarum exemplis Atticis*, p. 41.
[3] Cf. Herzog's article in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*, 1876, pp. 363 sqq.

ARGVMENTVM.

ARGVMENTVM. The *argumenta* (*ὑποθέσεις, περιοχαί*) prefixed to the plays of Plautus and Terence are not the work of these authors themselves. The Terence *argumenta*, which are non-acrostic and consist invariably of 12 Iambic Senarii, were composed in the 2nd century A.D. by C. Sulpicius Apollinaris, the contemporary of Fronto and the teacher of Aulus Gellius and of the Emperor Pertinax. The authorship of the Plautus *argumenta* is unknown. They are of two kinds: (1) Non-acrostic, for the *Persa*, *Pseudolus* and *Stichus* in the Ambrosian Palimpsest, and for the *Amphitruo*, *Aulularia*, *Mercator* and *Miles Gloriosus* in the other MSS., the MSS. of the 'Palatine' family, (2) Acrostic, for all the plays in the 'Palatine' MSS. (See Introd. i. § 15.) And there is this notable difference between the two, that the Acrostic verses, unlike the Non-acrostic, freely admit Hiatus, an admission due to the erroneous theory that Hiatus was not avoided in the archaic poetry[1]. In the Acrostic Argument before us therefore the Hiatus in v. 1 *pugna* | *Hegionis*, and v. 5 *inibi* | *emit*, cannot of itself suggest that the reading of the MSS. requires emendation. It is merely a pseudo-archaism. So is the spelling of the Acrostic itself, CAPTEIVEI instead of CAPTIVEI. In the time of Plautus the diphthong *ei* was not used indiscriminately for any long *i*-sound as it was in the time of Lucilius; but the simple vowel was used for original *ī*, the diphthong for *ei* (whether originally *ei* or *ai* or *oi*). Thus on the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus (186 B.C.), an inscription two years earlier than the death of Plautus, *dīcerent* (root deic- of Gk. *δείκ-νυμι* etc.) is spelt DEICERENT, *incīderetis* (root caid- of *caido*, *caedo*, weakened to ceid-) is spelt INCEIDERETIS, *foederatī* (with case-ending -oi of Gk. *ἄνθρωπ-οι* etc. weakened to -ei) is spelt FOIDERATEI, but

[1] We find on archaizing epitaphs of the Empire such lines as these (*Anthol. Lat.* i. 108; an Iambic Acrostic):—

Attónitus capita núnc uersorum | inspice,

(ibid. 486; a Dactylic Acrostic):

Littore Phocaico pelagi ui | exanimatas.

Latinus (with Adjective suffix -īno- of Gk. κορακ-ῖνος etc.) is spelt LATIN-. That Plautus spelt *mendīcus* (Adjective suffix -īco-) with the simple vowel *i* and *īra* (root eis-) with the diphthong *ei* is seen from the remarks in *Rud.* 1305 that *mendicus* has 'one letter more' than *medicus*, and in *Truc.* 262 that *eiram* 'anger' becomes *eram* 'mistress' by 'taking away a single letter.' The word *captivus* has the Adjective suffix -īvo- and would be spelt with the simple vowel in Plautus' time.

The 'tags' from which the Argument has been patched together are easily recognized, e.g. prol. 8 *Alterum quadrimum puerum seruus surrupuit Eumque...uendidit*, prol. 27 *Coepit captivos commercari hic Aleos*, prol. 36 *Quo pacto hic seruus suum erum hinc amittat domum: Itaque inter se conmutant uestem ac nomina*, v. 1011 *seruus qui te huic hinc quadrimum surrupuit, Vendidit...Illic indicium fecit.*

Captust in pugna Hegionis filius;
Alium quadrimum fugiens seruus uendidit.

Ab init. ad v. 904 *deest A* (*de O cf. ad v.* 400).
INCIPIT FABVLA CAPTIVORVM PLAVTI•ARGVMENTVM *B.* *unius versus spat. D.* INCIPIT FABVLA CAPTIVORVM PLAVTI•ARGVMENTVM *V.* Incipit fabula captiuorum plauti | ARGVMENTVM *E.* INCIPIT FABVLA CAPTIVORVM PLAVT*I (*erasa quinta littera*) ARGVMENTVM *J.*

1. Captus est *libri* (*pro* C *spat.* DV^1E) *inter* pugna *et* Hegionis *spat.* 7 *fere litt. VE* *super* filius *est glossa* philopolemus *scripta in J* (*ceteras huiusmodi in Argumento et Prologo commemorare nolui*)

---

1. The interval deliberately left blank between **pugna** and **Hegionis** in the two MSS. *V* and *E* (see Critical Notes) suggests that something has been lost between these two words. Schoell supposes that a hole in the page (of 21 lines) of a very early archetype (see Introd. i. § 3) left this verse and v. 11 of the Prologue[1] defective. But since the verse reads perfectly well as it stands, the Hiatus being, as we have seen, quite natural in an Acrostic Argument, and since no suitable 'missing word' has been produced by any scholar, it is safer to ascribe the peculiar transcription in the two less important MSS. to an accident of their original (as in vv. 620, 663, 941, where see Critical Notes). A descending 'flourish' of the heading ARGVMENTVM may have encroached on the line.

2. **Alium.** The harsh scansion *altérum* of prol. 8 *Alterum quadrimum puerum seruus surpuit* is avoided by the writer of the Argument. The same use of *alius* for *alter* is found in the last line of this Argument and

---

[1] Prol. 11 follows at an interval of 21 lines, one of which was occupied by the Prologue-heading.

Pater capteiuos commercatur Aleos,
Tantum studens ut natum <captum> recuperet;
Et inibi emit olim amissum filium.

---

3. capteiuos *Angelius ex acrosticho*: captiuos *libri* commercatur (u *ex* o) *D* aleos *BDV*^{1}*E*: alios *V*^{2}*J* 4. *suppl. Bothius, Brugmannus* 5. Et ibi *B*^{1}, *corr. B*^{2}

---

in v. 2 of the Argument to the *Casina*: *Conseruam uxorem conserui duo expetunt; Aliam senex adlegat, aliam filius.* It occurs also in some of the Terence Arguments (*Andr.* 12 *Hanc Pamphilo, aliam dat Charino coniugem; Haut.* 12 *Hanc Clinia, aliam Clitipho uxorem accipit*). This use of *alius* is found in post-classical writers, e.g. Tac. *Hist.* iv. 73, Sueton. *Tit.* 7. Cf. *Anthol. Lat.* i. 52 *horunc alterum* || *In terra linquit, alium sub terra locat.*

3. **Capteiuos.** This is the form postulated by the Acrostic. Yet all our MSS. have *captiuos.* It seems that in some early archetype the *ei*-diphthongs throughout the text were deliberately 'modernized' to ī, for on the one hand the traces that remain of the older spelling are much fewer than we should expect, and on the other we find now and then an *ei* wrongly changed to *i*, e.g. *uti* for *ut ei* in v. 940 (cf. ad v. 908).

4. Some word or other has dropped out in the archetype of our MSS. If it was **captum**, the loss would be caused by the similar ending (Homoeoteleuton) of the neighbouring word (*natum*), the commonest cause of the omission of a word in MSS. (cf. v. 74). Another plausible emendation is *recuperet* <*suom*>, for small, unimportant words were often omitted by scribes. **Studens ut.** In Plautus *studeo* takes the Inf. (e.g. *audire* Pseud. 523, *me recipere illam* Amph. 892, *nuptias mutarier* Stich. 52), or the Dative (of Noun or Gerundive, e.g. *lectis sternendis* Stich. 678, *his factis* Most. 29), very rarely the Acc. (e.g. *has res* Mil. 1437), but never *ut* with Subj. (cf. Ter. *Haut.* 382). **Recuperet.** The word *recupero*, though employed in this sense in good Latin, does not occur at all in Plautus or indeed in any of the Early Dramatists. Plautus uses *recipio* in this sense (v. 103 *ni illum recipit*). It is conceivable that the writer of the Argument who, as we have seen, freely avails himself of the diction of the play (e.g. *quadrimum, commercatur, amittatur, indicio*), meant *recuperet* for the Imperf. Subj. of *recipio* (in archaic spelling *recupio*). The non-sequence of the Tenses need not offer any difficulty (cf. v. 7).

5. **Inibi** was a word that would be known in the Imperial Age to students of archaic Latinity. It is treated, for example, by Nonius (p. 124 M.). There is therefore no need for Gulielmius' conjecture *in ībus.* We may admit that this form of the Dat. Abl. Plur. of *is* is used by

Is suo cum domino ueste uersa ac nomine
Vt amittatur fecit: ipsus plectitur.
Et is reduxit captum et fugitiuum simul,
Indicio cuius alium agnoscit filium.

---

6. Insuo V^1E ueste* *B*, *er.* s *ut vid.*: *om.* ueste *J* uersa (a *ex* e) *J*
9. Indicio (o *ex* um) *B*: Indixio D^2: Inditio *VE*.

Plautus (e.g. *Mil.* 74 *ut in tabellis quos consignavi hic heri Latrones, ibus dinumerem stipendium*), and would readily be changed to *ibi* by an ignorant scribe. But the only reason for substituting *in ibus* for *inibi* is to remove the Hiatus; and Hiatus is in Acrostic Arguments no evidence of a corruption in the text.

7. **Amittatur** with the old sense of *amitto* (class. *dimitto*), while *amissum* (v. 5) has the classical sense. The variations of Tense throughout this Argument (v. 3 *commercatur*, v. 5 *ēmit*, v. 7 *fecit...plectitur*, v. 8 *reduxit*, v. 9 *agnoscit*) are, like the variations of Pronoun (v. 6 *is...fecit*, of Tyndarus; v. 8 *is reduxit*, of Philocrates), due to the necessarily cramped form of an Acrostic. But they are not altogether out of keeping with the diction of the Republican Comedy.

[redacted]

PERSONAE.

ERGASILVS parasitus
HEGIO senex
LORARII
PHILOCRATES } captivi
TYNDARVS } captivi
ARISTOPHONTES adulescens
PVER
PHILOPOLEMVS adulescens
STALAGMVS servus

Personae. In accordance with the custom of modern editors I prefix an 'index personarum.' It is not found in the MSS. Donatus in his commentary on Terence tells us that the names of characters in Comedy were significant names (ad *Ad.* I. i. 1): nomina personarum, in comoediis dumtaxat, habere debent rationem et etymologiam. Etenim absurdum est comicum...vel nomen personae incongruum dare vel officium, quod sit a nomine diversum: hinc servus fidelis 'Parmeno,' infidelis vel 'Syrus' vel 'Geta,' miles 'Thraso' vel 'Polemo,' iuvenis 'Pamphilus,' matrona 'Myrrina' et puer vel ab odore 'Storax' vel a ludo et a gesticulatione 'Scirtus': et item similia, in quibus summum poetae vitium est, si quid e contrario (a charactere *edd.*) repugnans contrarium diversumque protulerit, nisi per *ἀντίφρασιν* ioculariter nomen imponit, ut 'Misargyrides' in Plauto dicitur trapezita.

Ergasilus suggests *ἐργάσιμος*, 'working for a livelihood' (often in sense of 'scortum'; cf. vv. 69 sqq.). Cf *Ὀνήσιλος* beside *ὀνήσιμος*.

Hegio is also the name of the old man in the *Adelphoe* of Terence, and of one of the 'advocati' in the *Phormio*.

Lorarii. The spelling *lolarius* has strong support from the MSS. of this play and of Gellius x. iii. 19. But the best orthography of the word was in all likelihood *lorarius*. (For statistics of the spelling see Schoell in

the Preface to his edition of the play, p. xiii.) The names of three 'lorarii' are given in v. 657 (see note).

Philocrates, like *Philopolemus*, is a suitable name for a young soldier.

Tyndarus. This is the name given him in Elis. His original name was *Paegnium*, lit. 'plaything' (v. 984).

Aristophontes, a name of the type of Ἀργειφόντης, Βελλεροφόντης, Κλεοφόντης, Πολυφόντης.

Stalagmus, lit. 'drop,' was a name applied to a man of diminutive stature. Cf. Anaxandrides *Com.* 34. 3 K:

Ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἀεὶ χλευάζετ', οἶδ' ἀκριβῶς·
Ἂν μὲν γὰρ ᾖ τις εὐπρεπής, ἱερὸν γάμον καλεῖτε·
Ἐὰν δὲ μικρὸν παντελῶς ἀνθρώπιον, σταλαγμόν.

Donatus (ad *Andr.* I. iii. 21) says of the slave-names in Comedy: semper autem nomina comicorum servorum aut a nationibus sunt indita, ut 'Mysis,' 'Syrus,' aut ex accidentibus ut 'Lesbia,' velut ebriosa, a Lesbo insula, quae est ferax suavissimi candidissimique vini, aut a moribus et vernilitate, ut 'Pseudolus,' aut ex negotio, ut 'Chrysalus,' aut ex qualitate corporis, ut 'Thylacus,' aut ex specie formae, ut 'Pinacium.' The name 'Stalagmus' belongs to the category 'ex qualitate corporis.'

The scene is laid in Aetolia, a fact which has to be expressly stated to the audience (v. 94 *Nam Aetolia haec est*), since the conventional locality was Athens. On the stage, which represents a street (v. 795 *hanc plateam*) before the house of Hegio (v. 96 *Senis qui hic habitat*), stand two young prisoners of war (v. 1 *Hos quos uidetis stare hic captiuos duos*) bound together by heavy chains (v. 113 *catenas...maiores quibus sunt iuncti*). One of them, Tyndarus, is supposed to be a man of 24 years (v. 980); the other, Philocrates, of about the same age (v. 20). By the convention of the Roman stage the town was supposed to lie on the right side, the harbour on the left side from the spectators. The play begins with a prologue, spoken probably by one of the younger actors (cf. Ter. *Haut.* prol. init.).

PROLOGVS.

PROLOGVS. That the prologue to a play of Plautus may be either wholly or in part the production of a later age we see from the prologue to the *Casina*, which professedly belongs to the generation immediately following the death of Plautus (vv. 5 sqq.):

Qui utuntur uino uetere sapientis puto
Et qui libenter ueteres spectant fabulas.
Anticua opera et uerba cum uobis placent
Aequom est placere ante alias ueteres fabulas[1];
Nam nunc nouae quae prodeunt comoediae
Multo sunt nequiores quam nummi noui.
Nos postquam populi rumore intelleximus
Studiose expetere uos Plautinas fabulas,
Anticuam eius edimus comoediam,
Quam uos probastis qui estis in senioribus;
Nam iuniorum qui sunt non norunt, scio;
Verum ut cognoscant dabimus operam sedulo.
Haec cum primum acta est, uicit omnis fabulas.
Ea tempestate flos poetarum fuit,
Qui nunc abierunt hinc in communem locum;
Sed tamen absentes prosunt <pro> praesentibus.

To determine whether or in what parts the prologue to the *Captivi* belongs to a later reproduction of the play is no easy matter. Ritschl supposed that the allusions to seats for the spectators (v. 12 *si non ubi sedeas locus est*; cf. v. 2) were proof of a post-Plautine origin, and quoted the story of the consul P. Scipio Nasica as evidence that seats were unknown till 155 B.C. The great authority attached to all Ritschl's statements has induced subsequent editors to accept this theory without due consideration of the evidence. For the passages of ancient authors in which the story is related do not really warrant this inference; e.g. Liv. *per.* xlviii. *Cum locatum a censoribus theatrum exstrueretur, P. Cornelio Nasica auctore, tamquam inutile et nociturum publicis moribus, ex senatus consulto destructum est; populusque aliquamdiu stans ludos spectavit*; S. Augustin. *Civ. D.* i. 31 *tantumque auctoritate* (*Nasica*) *valuit, ut eius verbis commota senatoria*

[1] An anticipation of Squire Hardcastle's sentiments: "I love everything that's old: old friends, old times, old manners, old books, old wine."

providentia etiam subsellia, quibus ad horam congestis in ludorum spectaculo iam uti civitas coeperat, prohiberet apponi. We have no good reason for doubting that seats were provided for the spectators as early as Plautus' time. In 194 B.C. the front places were reserved for senators. (For a full discussion of the question, see Fabia in *Revue de Philologie*, xxi. pp. 11 sqq.; Marquardt and Mommsen, *Röm. Alterthümer*[3] VI. p. 482.)

Various indications however of a post-Plautine authorship are pointed out in the notes to vv. 10, 19 (if we retain the reading of the MSS.), 34, 40, 49, 50, 54, 55. Their united evidence is strong enough to make a 'prima facie' case against the genuineness of the whole or the greater part of our prologue, especially since it does not contain any clear traces of Plautus' genius. It has the appearance here and there of having been made out of lines of the 'internal prologue' of the piece, the opening monologue of Ergasilus (see notes on vv. 4, 24, 27—8), with the subsequent remarks of Hegio (see note on v. 34).

The ancient commentators on Terence commend that poet for his skill in explaining to the audience the plot of a play in its opening scene. The first scene of the *Andria* is praised for its thoroughly satisfactory explanation of the plot without the clumsy aid of a narrative prologue or a 'deus ex machina' (Donat. in *Andr.* I. i. 1 *haec scaena pro argumenti narratione proponitur, in qua fundamenta fabulae iaciuntur, ut virtute poetae sine officio prologi vel θεῶν ἀπὸ μηχανῆς et periocham comoediae populus teneat et res agi magis quam narrari videatur*). This method is expressly alluded to by Terence himself in the prologue to the *Adelphoe*, vv. 22—4:

Dehinc ne expectetis argumentum fabulae,
Senes qui primi uenient, i partem aperient,
In agendo partem ostendent.

But it was not peculiar to Terence. Plautus follows it in more than one of his plays. Indeed the lines of Terence just quoted are a reminiscence of the prologue to the *Trinummus*, vv. 16—17:

Sed de argumento ne exspectetis fabulae,
Senes qui huc uenient, i rem uobis aperient.

In the *Captivi* the information required for the comprehension of the piece is given in the opening scenes of the play by Ergasilus (vv. 92—101), Hegio (vv. 110—1) and the two Captives (vv. 219 sqq.), and it seems at first sight as if the narrative in the prologue was superfluous. But there is one piece of information necessary, if not for the comprehension, at least for the appreciation of the play, which could not be imparted to the audience during the action of the play itself, and that is the relationship of one of the Captives to Hegio. It was absolutely necessary that the audience should know from the outset that Tyndarus was Hegio's long-lost son; for otherwise all the delicate irony of the situation in the scenes between Hegio and Tyndarus would be lost upon them, nor could they help being puzzled by the noble traits of the seeming slave's character. In no way could this

knowledge be conveyed to them except through the Prologue, for the only actor in the piece who could have enlightened them is Stalagmus; and he does not appear on the scene till the play is nearly over. There is, too, another justification for the narrative in the prologue. The plays of the Republican Dramatists were performed in the open air on some public holiday to a chance crowd. A complicated plot like that of the *Captivi*, including the assumption by Philocrates of the part of Tyndarus and by Tyndarus of the part of Philocrates, would require to be explained twice to such an audience. What appears to us garrulous prolixity in some of the prologues of Plautus was due to the practical necessity of securing the attention and the intelligence of a restless crowd of holiday-seekers. In the *Amphitruo*, where Jupiter personates King Amphitruo and Mercury his slave Sosia, there is a long prologue in which the spectators are first coaxed into good humour and attention, and finally, after being told the plot of the piece, are informed that the divine 'Sosia' will wear feathers on his cap to distinguish him from his human counterpart, while Jupiter, in the dress of Amphitruo, will be recognized by the golden knob under his head-gear. The *Menaechmi*, the original of the *Comedy of Errors*, is another example of a complicated plot requiring a long, and for our modern taste over-detailed, prologue.

Of the noisy, restless crowd, to which a dramatic author at Rome had to submit his production, we get a lively picture in the prologue to the *Poenulus*, where the speaker, assuming the functions of a military commander (*imperator histricus* v. 4), issues regulations for the discipline of his raw levies, vv. 11 sqq.:

Exsurge, praeco, fac populo audientiam;
...........edicta ut seruetis mea.
Scortum exoletum ne quis in proscaenio
Sedeat, neu lictor uerbum aut uirgae muttiant,
Neu dissignator praeter os obambulet
Neu sessum ducat, dum histrio in scaena siet.
Diu qui domi otiosi dormierunt, decet
Animo aequo nunc stent, vel dormire temperent.
Serui ne obsideant, liberis ut sit locus,
Vel aes pro capite dent; si id facere non queunt,
Domum abeant, uitent ancipiti infortunio,
Ne et hic uarientur uirgis et loris domi,
Si minus curassint, quom eri reueniant domum.
Nutrices pueros infantis minutulos
Domi ut procurent neu quae spectatum adferat,
Ne et ipsae sitiant et pueri pereant fame
Neue esurientes hic quasi haedi obuagiant.
Matronae tacitae spectent, tacitae rideant,
Canora hic uoce sua tinnire temperent,

Domum sermones fabulandi conferant,
Ne et hic uiris sint et domi molestiae.
......Dum ludi fiunt, in popinam, pedisequi,
Inruptionem facite; nunc, dum occasio est,
Nunc, dum scriblitae <aestu> aestuant, occurrite.
Haec imperata quae sunt pro imperio histrico,
Bonum hercle factum pro se quisque ut meminerit.

And the fate of a dramatist, who failed to get hold of his audience at the outset of the play, is known to us from the second prologue to the *Hecyra*, vv. 25 sqq.:

Cum primum eam agere coepi, pugilum gloria,
Funambuli eodem accessit (accersiti *Leo*) expectatio:
Comitum conuentus, strepitus, clamor mulierum
Fecere ut ante tempus exirem foras.
...refero denuo.
Primo actu placeo, cum interea rumor uenit
Datum iri gladiatores: populus conuolat,
Tumultuantur, clamant, pugnant de loco:
Ego interea meum non potui tutari locum.

We must bear this in mind in reading the prologue to the *Captivi*. The first care of the speaker of the prologue is to secure a peaceful and intelligent hearing of the complicated plot. He begins with a joke designed to put into good humour those usual disturbers of the peace, the late-comers who cannot find a seat (see note on v. 2, and cf. Apul. *Flor.* III. xvi. 65 *extimus quisque excuneati queruntur*), and, after a little, tries sterner methods with them (vv. 11—14). The plot is explained slowly, minutely, with many repetitions; and the most complicated part of it, the exchange of name and dress by the Captives, is driven into the minds of the audience by frequent indication of the two personages, who had for this very purpose been stationed on the stage before the commencement of the action of the play; e.g. vv. 38—9:

Illic uocatur Philocrates, hic Tyndarus:
Huius illic, hic illius hodie fert imaginem.

Another appeal for an attentive hearing follows (vv. 53 sqq.); then the audience is coaxed into good humour by some pleasantry; and the speaker of the prologue leaves the stage.

[redacted]

Hos quos uidetis stare hic captiuos duos,
Illi quia astant, hi stant ambo, non sedent;

PROLOGVS IN CAPTIVOS PLAVTI *BVE* (os *ex* is) *J.* *unius versus spat. D.* 1. os *cum spat. init.* V^1 (Nos V^2) *E* 2. qui astant *BD*: qui stant *VEJ* ambio *J*

---

1. **Hos quos uidetis...hi stant.** In Plautus we notice a predilection for the inclusion in the Relative clause of the Subject or Object of the sentence (cf. v. 179 *meliorem adferet Quae mi atque amicis placeat condicio magis*, and see note on v. 908). The same construction appears in Virgil *A.* i. 573 *Urbem quam statuo uestra est*, as well as in the colloquial Latin of Terence (e.g. *Eun.* 653 *Eunuchum quem dedisti nobis, quas turbas dedit!*) and the other Republican Dramatists. Often the Subject or Object is found in both clauses, e.g. *Mil.* 140:

> Nam unum conclaue concubinae quod dedit
> Miles, quo nemo nisi eapse inferret pedem.
> In eo conclaui ego perfodi parietem;

and this repetition, which looks like a laboured attempt at securing distinctness, is a feature of legal Latin, e.g. *quam rem praetor ex hac lege egerit, si eam rem*, &c. For the repetition of the Demonstrative Pronoun, as here, cf. *Poen.* 770 *Hi qui conciliauerunt...id nunc his cerebrum uritur*, and v. 110 below. (Full statistics of this Attraction in Latin will be found in Bach, *de Attractione quae dicitur Inversa apud scriptores Latinos.* Strassburg, 1888.)

2. **Illi quia astant.** Violent alterations of the reading (*Illi quiastant*) of the archetype of our MSS., such as *ita uincti qui astant* (Niemeyer), or *iugati* (*ui iuncti*) *qui astant* (Schoell), or *non uili quia stant* (Speyer), are quite uncalled for. The mere change of *quiastant* into *quia astant* gives a perfectly satisfactory sense. *Illi* are the disturbers at the back of the theatre, late-comers who are trying to find a seat. "The prisoners on the stage are standing up as a compliment to our friends at the back there," who are forced to stand because they are too late to find sitting-room. **Astant**, often of standing at the door, waiting outside, e.g. *Bacch.* 1134 A. *Cogantur quidem intro....*B. *Sic sine astent.* **Hi.** The confusion in Latin MSS. between *hi* (*hii*), *his* (*hiis*), case-forms of *hic*, and *i* (*ii*), *is* (*iis*) case-forms of *is*, is so universal that editors have no scruple in setting aside the evidence of MSS. in this particular. Here, however, *hi* is required to point the contrast to *illi* (cf. v. 130, *Mil.* 1007). Even where this marked contrast is absent the repetition of *hic* seems to have been the rule in cases of attraction of an antecedent *hic*, for the reading *his* is strongly attested in *Poen.* 770 (quoted in note on v. 1). **Ambo,** beside *duos* (v. 1), as in *Bacch.* 569 A. *Quid? duas?* B. *Atque ambas sorores,*

Hoc uos mihi testes estis me uerum loqui.
Senex qui hic habitat, Hegio, est huius pater.
Sed is quo pacto seruiat suo sibi patri,
Id ego hic apud uos proloquar, si operam datis.

3. Hoc uos B^2: Hos uos B^1DV^2E : Vos uos V^1 *ut vid.*: Vos quos *J ut vid.* testes *J*: testis *BDVE* *om.* estis *E* 4. *om.* hic *EJ* 5. seruiat (at *ex* it) *D* 6. Hic D^1 aego *D*

Amph. 974 *Iam hisce ambo, et seruos et era, frustra sunt duo.* Cf. Ital. *ambe due*, 'both.'

4. **Senex qui hic habitat.** Cf. v. 95 *Senis qui hic habitat.* **Huius** The speaker points to Tyndarus, who, it must be remembered, has changed clothes with the other captive, his master, Philocrates. The somewhat unusual scansion *huiūs*, with the last syllable long by position (see Introd. ii. § 3), probably indicates emphatic or deliberate pronunciation of the Pronoun (but cf. *Most.* 957). So *eiūs* in the impressive opening of the prologue to the *Rudens*, spoken by the god Arcturus: *Qui gentes omnes mariaque et terras mouet, Eius sum ciuis ciuitate caelitum.* (On the conventional monosyllabic form of these Pronoun Genitives, see Introd. ii. § 15.) I see no reason for reading *huiusc(e)* here (see note on v. 10), or for changing the order of the words (confirmed by v. 17) to *huius est pater* (as in v. 974; cf. 335, and see note on v. 809). Nor need we put a comma at *est* and make *huius pater* in apposition to *senex* (see note on v. 635).

5. **Suo sibi.** With the Reflexive Possessive *suus* the Reflexive Pronoun *sibi* &c. was used instead of *ei* &c. in everyday speech; e.g. *Trin.* 156 *Nunc si ille huc saluos reuenit, reddam suom sibi*, for 'suom ei.' This practice created in time the phrase *suus sibi*, 'very own,' in colloquial Latin, a phrase which is to all intents and purposes a single word, the Dative *sibi* being unaffected by the construction of the sentence. Cf. v. 46 *suă sibĭ fallacia*, 50 *suŏ sibĭ seruit patri*, 81 *Suŏ sibĭ suco uiuont*, Ter. *Ad.* 958 *Suo sibi gladio hunc iugulo.* In *Poen.* 1083 *Suam sibi rem saluam sistam*, the reading of the inferior MSS., *suam rem sibi*, which breaks up the word-group, is rightly rejected by editors; but there is no need to change passages like *Curc.* 178: *Sibi sua habeant regna reges, sibi diuitias diuites, ...sibi quisque habeant quod suom est*, which are not real instances of the phrase in question. *Suus sibi* reappears in later Latin, e.g. Apul. *Met.* vii. 13 *suis sibi gladiis obtruncatos*, Lactant. iii. 28. 20 *suo sibi gladio pereunt.*

6. **Proloquar**, of the prologue, also in *Amph.* prol. 50, *Cist.* 151. **Proloquar, si...datis.** The Present in the protasis with the Future in the apodosis is common in colloquial Latin; cf. v. 331 *eum si reddis mihi*,

[redacted]

Seni huic fuerunt filii nati duo;
Alterum quadrimum puerum seruus surrupuit
Eumque hinc profugiens uendidit in Alide
Patri huiusce†. Iam hoc tenetis? Optumest.

8. surrupuit *BDV*: suprupuit *E*: surripuit *J* 9. fugiens V^2J aulide V^2J 10. huisce *E*: huiusce <hominis> *nos*: huius cette *Schoellius* optumum est *libri*

...*Et te et hunc amittam hinc*, Mil. 1213 *diuitias dabo, si impetras.* The freedom that Plautus allowed himself with Conditional sentences may be seen from a comparison of *Pers.* 827 *malum ego uobis dabo, ni abitis*, *Mil.* 450 *nisi uoluntate ibis, rapiam te domum*, and *Bacch.* 1172 *ni abeas,... malum tibi magnum dabo iam.*

7. **Huic**, i.e. who lives in the house beside which I am standing (see note on v. 38).

8. **Alterum.** The compounds *altrinsecus, altrovorsum* are not sufficient evidence for a pronunciation of the simple Pronoun with *-tr-* instead of *-ter-*, so that I doubt the change in this verse of *alterum* to *altrum* and in *Pers.* 226 of *altera* to *altra.* The clash of metrical ictus (*altérum*) with word-accent (*álterum*) in a word of this form is tolerated by Plautus in the first foot of the line or hemistich (e.g. v. 833; see Introd. iii. § 9). Similarly at the beginning of *Most.* 630 *quattúor* need not be changed to the Vulg. Lat. form *quattor* (Introd. ii. § 15). Cf. Naev. *Com.* 23 sq. R. *Altéris inanem vólulam madidám dari, Altéris nuces in próclivi profúndere.* **Surrupuit**, pronounced as a trisyllable here and in two other passages of this play (vv. 760, 1011). Since the contracted pronunciation (cf. Hor. *C.* iv. 13. 20 *surpuerat*; Lucr. ii. 314 *surpere* Inf.) is restricted to these three instances, all of them at the end of the line, it was clearly not favoured by Plautus, and was adopted only through metrical exigencies. There is no authority for a shortened form of any other part of the verb in Plautus. We should scan *Pers.* 150 *únd(e) surrúpta sit*, Poen. 902 *índ(e) surrúptus* (see Introd. ii. § 14), *Poen.* 1058 *Surrúptus sum.*

9. **Profugiens** (cf. note on v. 18). **Vendidit** (Introd. ii. § 1). **Alide.** The un-Attic form of the name, with *A-*, not *E-*, is used by Plautus, with the result that *Alei, Aleos*, &c. are again and again confused with *alii, alios* in our MSS. (see note on v. 24).

10. **Huiusce.** This form is not found in Plautus, except at *Poen.* 1257 *Huiusce fratris filius*, and is rejected by most editors as un-Plautine. It is however used by Terence (*Andr.* 439, *Phorm.* 827, where it stands before an initial vowel). Perhaps *hominis*, written *hois*, may have been dropped out here and elsewhere (e.g. *Poen.* prol. 83) from our MSS. after the Gen. of the Pronoun (old spelling *hoius*; as in *A* at *Pseud.* 271). Schoell reads

Negat hercle illic ultimus. Accedito.
Si non ubi sedeas locus est, est ubi ambules,
Quando histrionem cogis mendicarier.

11. ille *libri* 13. hystrionem *B*

patri huius: cette (Plur. of *cĕdo*, 'tell me'). If this prologue be of late composition, there is also the possibility of a pseudo-archaism *huĭusce* (4 syll.), like *anticuam* (4 syll.) in the prologue (v. 5) of the *Casina* (quoted on p. 113), or even of Hiatus (cf. *Aul.* prol. 5 *patrĭ* | *auóque*). It may be remarked that the same question arises about a line (v. 83) of the prologue of the *Poenulus*: *Sed illi patruo huius qui uiuit senex*, where some editors would substitute *huiusce*. **Tenetis.** *Teneo*, 'I understand' (Gk. ἔχω), is common in colloquial Latin (with *iam* as here, *Epid.* 401 *iam tenes?*, *Trin.* 780 *tenes iam?*). It occurs with some equivalents in *Pers.* 333 *scis? tenes? intellegis?* (cf. v. 697 below), and is occasion of a pun in *Curc.* 44 A. *Recte tenes.* B. *Minus formidabo, ne excidat*, and *Poen.* 565. **Optumest,** κάλλιστα ἔχει, 'very good,' the superlative of *bene est* (e.g. v. 699; cf. *pessumest* Amph. 314), has been wrongly expanded in our MSS. to *optumum est*, τὸ ἄριστόν ἐστι, 'it is the best plan' (e.g. v. 557 *concedi optumumst*). The same corruption is found in the 'Palatine' MSS. at *Stich.* 537 (cf. *Stich.* 120 *minimum est* for *minimest*), and in *A* at *Bacch.* 502.

11. The reading of the MSS. is quite satisfactory, with the single exception that the archaic Nom. Sing. *illĭc* (*ille* with the Particle *-ce* affixed) has been modernized in the usual fashion. If we restore *illic* (cf. ad v. 39) the line becomes metrical; for *ultimūs* is a legitimate case of 'syllaba anceps' at a pause in the line (cf. Introd. ii. § 33). *Accedito*, 'let him come forward' (hardly 2 Sg.; see note on v. 114), should not be changed to *abscedito* (Rost). The speaker requires the disturber at the back of the theatre to come forward towards the stage, and, when the order has been obeyed, addresses him in the terms of vv. 12—14, then resumes (in v. 15) his narrative to the audience. Schoell's hypothesis of an omission after *ultimus* (see note on arg. 1) is unnecessary.

12. 'If there is no sitting-room inside, there is walking-room outside.' **Vbi sedeas locus.** The Relative clause which defines a Noun often precedes it; cf. *Aul.* 673 *Nunc hoc ubi abstrudam cogito solum locum*, *Rud.* 111 [*An*] *quo furatum mox uenias uestigas loca?*, Most. 969 *quo uenerim noui locum*, Most. 244 *Quae pro me causam diceret, patronum liberaui.* **Est ubi ambules** clearly intimates expulsion from the theatre. To find in the words a permission to walk about in the passage in front of the stage is absurd.

13. Equally absurd, as it seems to me, is the explanation of this line

[redacted]

Ego me tua causa, ne erres, non rupturus sum.

---

14. cusa *E* erras *V*[1] rupturus (*ex* rapt-) *E*

---

as 'you are forcing the actor to beg for his bread, his occupation being gone owing to the injury done to his vocal organs.' (Cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 18 *ille ad famem hunc a studio studuit reicere.*) The way in which the disturber was turning the *histrio* into a beggar, was that he was compelling him to beg for a quiet hearing. We have the same idea in the concluding passage of *All's Well that Ends Well:*

> The king's a beggar, now the play is done:
> All is well ended, if this suit be won,
> That you express content.

Quando has here the causal sense (cf. v. 886), a sense commoner in Terence than in Plautus. **Mendicarier.** The Pass. Inf. in *-ier* is not found in the Dramatists except at the end of a line; that is to say, it is an unusual form that is employed only through metrical exigencies. With a short antepaenultima, e.g. *derĭpier* Men. 1006, it is almost unknown. *Mendicor*, 'to be a beggar,' the Deponent type (cf. *philosophor*, *poetor*), occurs again in *Vidul.* fr. xv. (iii.), *malim moriri meos quam mendicarier*; but the Active *mendico*, 'to beg,' was more in vogue, whether with an Acc., e.g. *Amph.* 1032 *senecta aetate a me mendicas malum*, or in absolute use, e.g. *Bacch.* 508 *Adeo ego illam cogam usque ut mendicet—meus pater.* **Cogis mendicarier.** Reinkens (*über Acc. cum Inf. bei Plautus.* Düsseld. 1887, p. 9) seems to speak of this construction of *cogo* as unusual in Plautus. But cf. *Pseud.* 150, *Epid.* 586.

14. **Ne erres** has the meaning 'to keep you from misunderstanding the plot of the play' in the other occurrences of the phrase in prologues, such as *Trin.* 4 *Nunc, ne quis erret uostrum, paucis in uiam Deducam, si quidem operam dare promittitis*, Mil. 150 *Et mox ne erretis, haec duarum hodie uicem Et hinc et illinc mulier feret imaginem*, Men. 47 *Ne mox erretis, iam nunc praedico prius: Idem est ambobus nomen geminis fratribus.* The sense 'do not delude yourself,' 'do not imagine it,' is expressed otherwise in e.g. *Rud.* 1255 *Ego tibi daturus nihil sum, ne tu frustra sis* (cf. *Capt.* 854), *Poen.* 527 *Ne tu opinere, haud quisquam hodie nostrum curret per uias*, *Cas.* prol. 64 *Is, ne expectetis, hodie in hac comoedia In urbem non redibit.* But Terence so uses *ne erres* in *Andr.* 704 *huic, non tibi habeo, ne erres.* (In *Most.* 75 *Ne tu hercle* seems to be the right reading.) **Rupturus sum,** 'will crack my lungs'—with shouting, *Cas.* 809 *dirumpi hymenaeum cantando licet*; with running, *Poen.* 540 *Tua causa nemo nostrorumst suos rupturus ramites*, Merc. 151 *qui me rupi causa currendo tua.* The Greek word is διαρραγῆναι, e.g. Lucian *Char.* 21 ἦν καὶ σὺ κεκραγὼς διαρραγῇς. On the scansion *rupturŭs sum* (common before *s*-), see Introd ii. § 3.

Vos qui potestis ope uestra censerier,
Accipite relicuom: alieno uti nihil moror.

15. censenrier V^2J 16. reliquom *libri* niohil *E*

15. 'You whose means entitle you to be rated on the censor's list,' *opibus censi* and not *capite censi*. **Ope.** The Singular Number of this word is associated with the meaning 'help,' e.g. *opem ferre alicui* (= *opitulari alicui*), the Plural with the sense 'resources,' 'means,' 'wealth,' e.g. *dives opum* (cf. *in-ops*, *in-opia*, *cōpia*, i.e. 'co-ŏpia'); cf. Ennius *Trag.* 89 R. *ex opibus summis opis egens, Hector, tuae.* But the line dividing the two meanings is not very sharply drawn in the diction of Plautus (cf. *Mil.* 220 *opem auxiliumque* with *Rud.* 349 *orbas auxilique opumque*), whose use of the Plural seems often to be due to the presence of other Plurals in the sentence, e.g. *Capt.* 517 *spes opes auxiliaque*, *Amph.* 1053 *spes atque opes uitae meae*, Merc. 111 *summis opibus uiribusque*, *Most.* 348 *summis opibus atque industriis*, Trin. 467 *uostras...factiones atque opes*. There is therefore no ground of objection to the use of the Singular here or *Epid.* 152 *Aliqua ope exsoluam, extricabor aliqua.* **Censerier.** On the termination see note on v. 13.

16. 'Receive the instalment (of the narrative) that is still due. I do not care to be a debtor.' The idea of the speaker of the prologue being in the debt of his audience recurs in the prologue to the *Cistellaria* vv. 188—9:

Nunc quod relicuom restat uolo persoluere,
Ut expungatur nomen, ne quid debeam.

We have a similar idea in other Latin writers, e.g. Auct. ad Herenn. ii. 31. 50 *nos alacriores ad relicum persoluendum.* **Relicuom.** This Adj. is invariably quadrisyllabic (with the first syllable short) in the Republican Dramatists, and (with the first syllable long) in the Republican Epic Poets. It appears as a trisyllable in Persius and subsequent poets. **Nihil moror,** 'I do not care,' with Inf., as here, or with Acc., as in *Most.* 746 *nihil moror mi istiusmodi clientis*, is a common expression in colloquial Latin, meaning literally (since *moror* has always a transitive sense in early Latin) 'I do not at all detain,' 'I have no inclination to detain.' This was the formula with which the consul ended a sitting of the senate, *nihil uos moramur, patres conscripti*, and the judge gave a verdict of acquittal, e.g. *C. Sempronium nihil moror* Liv. iv. 42. 8; *quum se nihil morari magistrum equitum pronuntiasset* viii. 35. 8. **Nihil** is occasionally a disyllable at the end of the line (i.e. for metrical convenience) in Terence, (*Phorm.* 940, *Haut.* 896), but clear evidence that the disyllabic pronunciation was recognized by Plautus is wanting (see *Truc.* 333, 696, and below, v. 103; cf. Introd. ii. § 15).

Fugitiuus ille, ut dixeram ante, huius patri
Domo quem profugiens dominum abstulerat uendidit.
Is postquam hunc emit, dedit eum huic gnato suo

18. profugiens B^2*VEJ*: profugens B^1*D* abstulerit B^1, *corr.* B^2 *ut vid.*
19. Is *Fleckeisenus*: Hic *libri*

17. **Dixeram.** The Pluperfect Ind. of *sum* is frequently used for the Perfect in colloquial Latin (e.g. v. 305); but probably not the Pluperfect of other Verbs. We must take the Tense here to imply 'I had said, prior to the disturbance which caused my digression' (cf. ad v. 938). In the *Mostellaria* (820—1) the expression *empti fuerant*, 'they were bought,' that falls from the lips of Simo, is seized upon by the cunning slave Tranio as a means of making his master Theopropides believe that Simo has again sold the house which he had purchased:

Th. Non uideor uidisse postis pulcriores. Si. Pol mihi
Eo pretio empti fuerant olim. Tr. Audin 'fuerant' dicere?

This use of *fueram* for *fui* was the beginning of that tendency to substitute the Pluperfect for the Perfect which we see in Late Latin and which is reflected in the Romance Languages, e.g. Old French *vidra*, 'he saw.' (For a fuller account see Blase, *Geschichte des Plusquamperfekts*. Giessen, 1894.) On the scansion *huiŭs patri* see note on v. 4.

18. The reading of the original (P^{BD}) of our MSS., *profugens*, can be so easily explained by the practice of writing *g* and *i* in ligature in early minuscule that it would be unwise to reject the correction supplied in other MSS., *profugiens*. It may however be mentioned that in the only instance of the Adj. *profugus* in Plautus, *Trin.* 701 *Effugias ex urbe inanis, profugus patriam deseras*, our MSS. offer the unmetrical *profugiens*, which editors suppose to have been a gloss written above *profugus* in some early archetype (cf. *profugus*: *profugiens* Loewe, *Glossae Nominum*, p. 205). Since the traces of the Aorist Tense in Plautus are limited to 'Aorist' Subjunctives like *evenat* (Pres. *eveniat*), *attigas* (Pres. *attingas*), which are few in number and of restricted usage, it would be hazardous to add to them a supposed 'Aorist' participle, *profugens* (cf. class. Lat. *parens*, Pres. *pariens*); though it must be allowed that the normal rhythm would be secured for this line by reading *Domó quem profugens* (or *profugus*); see note on v. 111. **Dominum**, 'his young master,' *filium erilem*.

19. **Is.** The use of *hic* in the sense of *is* (the Pronoun that indicates a person or thing already mentioned) is not unknown in a later age; and if the reading of the MSS., *hic postquam hunc emit dedit eum huic gnato suo*, be right, there would be reason for believing that this portion at least

Peculiarem, quia quasi una aetas erat.
Hic nunc domi seruit suo patri, nec scit pater.
Enimuero di nos quasi pilas homines habent.
Rationem habetis, quo modo unum amiserit.
Postquam belligerant Aetoli cum Aleis,

---

20. etas *BD* *vv.* 21—2 *secl. Schoellius, transp. post v.* 4 *Niemeyerus* 22. Enim *Pylades*: Est *libri* dinos (*ex* amos) *V* 23. Racionem *J* 24. belli gerant *B*¹, *conj. B*² actolli *E* alidis *T* (*ut vid.*) *BD* (is *ex* es) *VE*: aulidis *J*

---

of the prologue was not written by Plautus. But the reading may be merely a scribe's error, due to the recurrence of the Demonstrative *hic* in this and the neighbouring lines (cf. v. 335). Perhaps *is* had, as so often happens in early MSS., been misspelt *his*. **Emit** is probably not Historical Present (*ĕmit*) like *belligerant* in v. 24, where the main verb *capitur* is also Hist. Pres., but Perfect (*ēmit*); so *dedit* will have pyrrich scansion.

20. **Quasi una**, 'about the same,' a common use of *quasi* (as of Ital. 'quasi'); cf. Sall. *Hist.* iii. fr. 26 *quasi par festinatio.* Their age was four years, at the time of the action of the play twenty-four (cf. v. 980). The change to *quasi una aetate erat* (cf. *Merc.* 520 *De lanificio neminem timeo, una aetate quae sit*) would be easy, but is not necessary. Nor need we follow some editors in bracketing or transposing after v. 4 the two following lines, vv. 21—2. Like vv. 50—51 they serve the purpose of impressing on the minds of the audience a cardinal point of the plot (see note on v. 44). The moral reflection in v. 22 finds a fitting place at the end of the story of Tyndarus, as the similar moral reflection in v. 51 is placed at the end of the rest of the narrative.

22. *Merc.* 225 *Miris modis di ludos faciunt hominibus*, Ter. *Ad.* 739 *Ita vita est hominum quasi quom ludas tesseris*, Alexis fr. 34 K. Τοιοῦτο τὸ ζῆν ἐστιν ὥσπερ οἱ κύβοι, Dekker, *Old Fortunatus* I. i. "This world is Fortune's ball wherewith she sports." **Enimuero.** Pylades' emendation of the *est uero* of the MSS. is generally adopted, although a change of *enim* to *est* in early MSS. is not easy to explain. *Est uervm* in the sense of *verum est verbum quod memoratur* (*Truc.* 885) is less likely, though more easy to account for on palaeographical grounds (cf. *vero* and *verum* confused in the MSS. at v. 75), and the same may be said of *Hem uero di nos*, &c. (cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 790 [*Hem*] *uir uiro quid praestat*).

23. **Rationem habetis.** The phrase is quite in keeping with the metaphor of v. 16. Cf. *Most.* 304 *ratio accepti atque expensi.*

24. *Belligero*, for *bellum gero*, an Active compound of the same type as the Deponent *morigeror* (v. 198 &c.), for *morem gero*, is used precisely as

[redacted]

Vt fit in bello, capitur alter filius.
Medicus Menarchus emit ibidem in Alide.
Coepit captiuos commercari hic Aleos,
Si quem reperire posset qui mutet suum,

---

25. bello *ex* belli *B* 26. aulide V^2J 27. Cepit *BDV* comercari B^1DV: cōmercari B^2 *ut vid.* *E*: commercari *J* alios *libri* 28. repperire *DEJ* possit *Reizius* qui *Pareus*: cum quo *libri*

---

here by the Auct. ad Herenn. iv. 11. 16: *socii nostri cum belligerare nobiscum vellent.* **Postquam belligerant.** The Historical Present with *postquam* is generally accompanied by the same Tense in the main clause, as here: *postquam belligerant...capitur*, and v. 487 *abeo ab illis, postquam video me sic ludificarier.* **Cum Aleis.** Hiatus of monosyllabic words ending in *-m* or in a long vowel is most frequent in Latin poetry when accompanied by a short syllable, e.g. *quĭ ămant* Virg., but we have in Plautus also scansions like *de hordeo* (with *-e* unelided) *Asin.* 706, *cum hac cum istac* (with *-um* unelided) *Cas.* 612 (see Introd. ii. § 41). There is no need therefore of supposing Plautus to have used the native form *Valei* (Ϝαλεῖοι) for *Alei.* (On coins of Elis, of which we have examples as late as the 2nd century B.C., the name appears as Ϝαλείων, Gen. Pl.) The rhythm of the line suffers from the clash of accent and metrical ictus in the spondee in the fourth foot, (*Aet*)*oli*; but the difficulty of fitting into one verse so many polysyllabic words may serve as excuse (see Introd. iii. § 7). We need not suppose a word to have dropped out from the line. History is silent about this war between Aetolia and Elis, which may have occurred in the troubled times that followed the death of Alexander the Great. (Cf. Hueffner, *de Plaut. Com. Exempl. Att.* p. 314.) The line closely corresponds with v. 93 *Ita nunc belligerant Aetoli cum Aleis.*

25. **Vt fit** is not found elsewhere in Plautus.

26. **Emit,** Perf. not Pres., for *ĭbĭdem* is the normal scansion in Plautus (Introd. ii. § 16).

27. **Hic,** Pron. (cf. v. 7).

28. **Posset** is changed by most editors to *possit.* But Plautus does not follow the rules of Sequence of Tenses so strictly as Cicero; and in view of passages like *Pseud.* 795—6:

> Quin ob eam rem Orcus recipere ad se hunc noluit,
> Ut esset hic qui mortuis cenam coquat,

the change cannot be said to be necessary.

Si quem reperire posset, 'in hope to find someone.' This final sense of *si* is well established. Apart from the phrase *expectare si* (Subj.),

—Illum captiuom: hunc suum esse nescit, qui domist.—

29. domi est V^2J

e.g. *Trin.* 98 *Exspecto si quid dicas*, we find in the protasis normally the verb *posse* or *quire*, which is in the Indicative when present or future time is referred to and the first person is employed, but in all other circumstances in the Subjunctive; e.g. (1) Indicative:

Men. 417 adsentabor, quidquid dicet, mulieri
Si possum hospitium nancisci.

Curc. 701
Animum aduortite <hoc>, si possum hoc inter uos componere.

Trin. 921
Quod ad exemplum est? coniectura si reperire possumus?

Trin. 958
Enim uero ego nunc sycophantae huic sycophantari uolo,
Si hunc possum illo mille nummum Philippum circumducere.

(2) Subjunctive:

Mil. 1207 nam si possem ullo modo
Impetrare ut abiret, ne te abduceret, operam dedi.

Most. 837
At tu isto ad uos optuere, quoniam cornicem nequis
Conspicari, si uolturios forte possis contui.

Cist. 182 ille extemplo seruolum
Iubet illum eundem persequi, si qua queat
Reperire quae sustulerit. Ei rei nunc suam
Operam usque assiduo seruos dat, si possiet
Meretricem illam inuenire.

Trin. 557 Quin hic quidem cupit illum ab se abalienarier,
Si quem reperire possit cui os sublinat.

Trin. 531 Em istic oportet opseri mores malos,
Si in opserendo possint interfieri.

There are a few examples of other than these normal types of expression with *si*, e.g. *Pseud.* 1148 *iamdudum, si des, porrexi manum*, Trin. 148 *ausculto si quid dicas.*

Qui, class. *quo* (see note on v. 101). *Cum quo* of the MSS. is a gloss. The thing exchanged stands normally in the Ablative, while *cum* indicates the other party to the transaction; cf. Sallust *Jug.* xliv. 5 *lixae...pecoris et mancipiorum praedas certantes agere eaque mutare cum mercatoribus vino advecticio et aliis talibus.* These lines closely correspond with vv. 100—1 *Homines captiuos commercatur, si queat Aliquem inuenire suum qui mutet filium.*

[redacted]

Et quoniam heri indaudiuit, de summo loco
Summoque genere captum† esse equitem Aleum,
Nihil pretio parsit, filio dum parceret:
Reconciliare ut facilius posset domum,

---

30. indaudiuit *Gulielmius Qu. in Capt. p.* 354: inde audiuit *libri* (inde audiunt *J*) 31. Summo quae *J* captum <unum> *Schoellius* *om.* esse *E* aequitem *V* aleum *etiam T ut vid.* 32. Nichil *EJ* precio *DVJ*

---

30. **Indaudiuit.** The old preposition *endo*, 'in,' 'into' (cf. Gk. *ἔνδο-θι*, *ἔνδο-θεν*, *ἔνδον*), later spelt *indo* and *indu*, had dropped out of use before the time of Plautus. It remained in compounds like *indo-tueri*, *indu-perator*, *indu-pedio*, *indu-gredior*, most of which were in time ousted by the rival compounds with *in*: *intueri*, *imperator*, *impedio*, *ingredior*, only a few surviving to the Classical Latin age, e.g. *indigeo*, *indoles*. *Inaudio* had already supplanted *indaudio* by the time of Terence, and is often substituted for the older form in MSS. of Plautus. Thus in *Stich.* 77 *indaudiuerim* is written in the Ambrosian Palimpsest *inaudiuerim*, but in the Palatine MSS. with the same corruption as here, *inde audiuerim*. Plautus seems never to have used the form *inaudio*.

31. The line as offered in the MSS. is defective. To restore the metre by means of the form *Valeum* (see note on v. 24) is unwise, for the MSS. nowhere give a trace of this form, and the adoption of it would destroy the metre in vv. 59, 880. We must suppose either that *captum* is a corruption of *captivum* (as in *Epid.* 564 *captam* and *captivam* are confused in the MSS.), or that some word has dropped out of the line (*captum* <*unum*> *esse* Schoell). With the passage we may compare *Epid.* 107 *captiuam genere prognatam bono In praeda es mercatus.*

32. 'To save his son he would not save his money.' **Parsit.** This is the Plautine form of the Perfect of *parco*. In *Aul.* 381 *Profesto egere liceat nisi peperceris*, the true reading may be *nisi si parseris*, as in *Truc.* 375 *Utinam a principio rei item parsisses meae, Ut nunc repercis sauiis*, the Ambrosian Palimpsest has substituted *pepercisses* for *parsisses*. But the class. form *peperci* is found in Terence *Adel.* 562 *Nil pepercit.* In Early Latin the Acc. was used with *parco*. The ancient formula at sacrifices, corresponding to Gk. *εὐφήμει*, was *parcito linguam* (Paul. Fest. 279. 9 Th. '*Parcito linguam' in sacrificiis dicebatur, id est coerceto, contineto, taceto*); and the same construction is attested (Schol. ad Virg. *Aen.* x. 532) for *Mil.* 1220 *Ne parce uocem* (where our MSS. have changed *uocem* to *uoci*); cf. *Pseud.* 78 *id quidem hercle ne parsis.* For the play on the word cf. *Curc.* 639 *O Pietas mea, Serua me, quando ego te seruaui sedulo.*

33. **Reconciliare.** The verb is used more than once in this, but in

Emit hosce de praeda ambos de quaestoribus.
Hisce autem inter sese hunc confinxerunt dolum,

34. preda *DEJ* e praeda *Studemundus dubitanter* questoribus *libri* (-tior- D^1J) 35. Hice B^2 *ut vid.* *om.* hunc *VEJ* confixerunt DV^1J dolum *ex* domum *D*

no other play of Plautus: v. 168 *nam illum confido domum In his diebus me reconciliassere*, v. 576 *Si huius huc reconciliasso in libertatem filium.* The simple verb (used in v. 131 *Sed si ullo pacto huc conciliari potest*) is common enough, whether with this (*Epid.* 654 *Et sororem in libertatem idem opera concilio mea*) or other meanings. **Ut facilius.** We have also *quo facilius*, e.g. *Aul.* prol. 27 *Feci, thensaurum ut hic reperiret Euclio Quo illam facilius nuptum, si uellet, daret*, ib. 33 *id ea faciam gratia, Quo ille eam facilius ducat.*

34. **Ambos**, "emphasized, for at first sight there seems no reason why Hegio should have bought a captive like Tyndarus...Finding that these two captives were master and slave, and hoping that this fact would facilitate the exchange, he bought them both." Hallidie. **De praeda.** Since *de praeda emere* is the usual Plautine phrase (cf. vv. 111, 453, *Epid.* 64; in *Epid.* 621 *emi ex praeda* in the Palatine MSS., but *emi de praeda* in the Ambrosian Palimpsest), one hesitates to follow editors in changing *de* to *e*, especially as the reading is corroborated by v. 111. On the other hand *hosce* is the form used before an initial vowel, not an initial consonant, in Plautus, although in *Bacch.* 787 we have *hasce tabellas* (to be scanned *hasc' tabellas*). We should scan *ĕmĭt hosc' de.* **De quaestoribus.** It was the quaestors whose duty it was to sell *sub hasta* the booty taken in war by the Roman army. In the *Bacchides* v. 1075 the pretended general on his victorious return laden with spoils says: *Nunc hanc praedam omnem iam ad quaestorem deferam.*

35. **Hisce.** In early Latin *hisce* (spelt properly *heisce*), *illisce*, *istisce* were the usual forms of the Nom. Plur. Masc. of the Pronoun augmented by the Particle *-ce*. This curious usage, apparently produced by the addition of the Plural-suffix *-s* to the already formed Plurals *hi*, *illi*, *isti*, is on inscriptions occasionally extended beyond its original limits; e.g. *heis sunt duo concordes* on an epitaph, *C.I.L.* i. 1071, *magistreis Cererus*, 'magistri Cereris,' on a Capua inscr. of Sulla's time, *C.I.L.* i. 566, but not in literature (unless we admit it in Virg. *Ecl.* iii. 102 *His certe, neque amor causa est, vix ossibus haerent*). In Plautus the forms *hi*, *illi*, *isti* are found as a rule when the next word begins with a consonant; *hisce*, *illisce*, *istisce* are never found unless it begins with a vowel. **Confinxerunt dolum** (cf. 47). Accius has the same verb, *Trag.* 639 R.: *amore uecors flammeo, Depositus facinus pessimum ex dementia Confingit* (where *depositus* has the sense of *desperatus*). Cf. Ter. *Hec.* 693 *Confingis falsas causas ad discordiam*; *And.* 558 *lacrumae confictae dolis.*

Quo pacto hic seruos suum erum hinc amittat domum.
Itaque inter se conmutant uestem et nomina;
Illic uocatur Philocrates, hic Tyndarus:
Huius illic, hic illius hodie fert imaginem.

---

36. hic seruus B^2: his seruus B^1D: his seruum *V*: hic seruum *E*: is seruos *J* herum *VJ* 37. Itaquae *J* interre V^1E: inter sese J^1 conmutant *E*: cōmutant *DV*: commutant *BJ* 38. philocrathes *B*: philochrates *V* tindarus *libri* 39. ille *Fleckeisenus*

---

36. **Amittat,** class. *dimittat.* This is the literal sense of the word and perhaps the most common sense in Plautus, 'I send away' (*a-mitto*). Next we have 'I allow to go away,' e.g. *rudentem amittas*, 'let go the rope,' *Rud.* 1031. Lastly the word is applied to cases where the removal of the object is against one's will, 'I lose' (e.g. vv. 23, 143 *Quom quae in potestate habuimus, ea amisimus*). But the literal sense should always be assigned to the word in Plautus where it is possible (see note on v. 655). *Vitam amittere*, Asin. 611, means 'to kill oneself,' not 'to lose one's life.'

38. **Illic...hic.** The speaker is standing beside the pretended Tyndarus. The Demonstratives *hic*, *iste* (*istic*), *ille* (*illic*) are used with scrupulous correctness by Plautus: *hic* with reference to the First Personal Pronoun, *iste* to the Second, *ille* to the Third. Thus we have *sequere hac*, i.e. 'by the route I am taking,' *abi istac*, i.e. 'by the path before you,' while *illac* would refer to a route distant from both parties. Cf. *Poen.* 649 A. *Quis hic est?* B. *Nescimus nos quidem istum qui siet.* An utterance like *per hanc dexteram te oro* implies that the speaker takes hold of the other's hand. In the *Menaechmi* at v. 202, where Menaechmus says *cape tibi hanc* (sc. *pallam*), the cloak is in Menaechmus' hands; at v. 205, where he remarks, *Quattuor minis ego emi istanc anno uxori meae*, it has passed into the hands of Erotium. The disposition of the actors &c. on the stage may be detected from the alternation of *hic*, *iste*, *ille* in the dialogue. (For fuller details see Bach in Studemund's *Studien* ii.)

39. Cf. *Mil.* 151 *Et hinc et illinc mulier feret imaginem*, Amph. 141 *seruos, cuius ego fero hanc imaginem.* **Illic.** This old Nom. form *illic*, differing from *ille* as Acc. *illunc* from *illum*, is over and over again changed to *ille* by scribes who know only the Adv. *illic*. The converse change, from *ille* to *illic*, which some editors assume for this line, is very unlikely. Besides, the incidence of the metrical ictus which is secured by the reading of the MSS. exactly corresponds to the incidence of stress in the utterance of a phrase like this, *huius illic hic illius.* The last word will have that disyllabic pronunciation which is indicated in several lines of Plautus, e.g. *Epid.* 717 A. *Ain tu te illius inuenisse filiam?* B. *Inueni,*

Et hic hodie expediet hanc docte fallaciam,
Et suum erum faciet libertatis compotem,
Eodemque pacto fratrem seruabit suum
Reducemque faciet liberum in patriam ad patrem,
Inprudens: itidem ut saepe iam in multis locis
Plus insciens quis fecit quam prudens boni.

---

40. fallatiam *libri* (-ci- *J*) 41. herum *VJ* fatiet *E* 42. seruauit *libri* (-bit V^2J) 43. fatiet *E* patrem *ex* patriam *B* 44. Imprudens *J* itidem ut *D*: itidemque ut *B*: itidem et *VEJ* sepe *libri* (sae- *V*?)

---

et domi est (Trochaic Septenarius), and which is generally explained as 'illis' (cf. *alis* for *alius*) (Introd. ii. § 15).

40. The spondee-word **docte** in the fourth foot makes the rhythm unpleasing (see Introd. iii. § 7, and note on v. 24).

43. Cf. v. 686.

44—5. The moral reflection in a prologue (cf. vv. 22, 51) is quite in the style of the New Comedy. The Greek critics applied to such *γνῶμαι* the term *ἐπιφωνήματα*, as we see from a passage of Theon *Progymn.* p. 91 Sp.: *ἐπιφωνεῖν δὲ διηγήσει ἐστὶ τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον μέρος τῆς διηγήσεως γνώμην ἐπιλέγειν· τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον οὔθ' ἱστορίᾳ πρέπον ἐστὶν οὔτε πολιτικῷ λόγῳ, θεάτρῳ δὲ καὶ σκηνῇ μᾶλλον ἐπιτήδειον. διὸ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς τοιούτοις ποιηταῖς ἐπιπλεῖστόν ἐστιν, ὡς παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ πολλαχοῦ μὲν ἀλλαχόθι καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ δὲ τοῦ τε Δαρδανίου καὶ τοῦ Ξενολόγου.*

ἀνδρὸς πένητος υἱὸς ἐκτεθραμμένος
οὐκ ἐξ ὑπαρχόντων ὁρῶν ᾐσχύνετο
τὸν πατέρα μίκρ' ἔχοντα· παιδευθεὶς γὰρ εὖ
τὸν καρπὸν εὐθὺς ἀπεδίδου καλόν.

ὁ γὰρ τελευταῖος στίχος ἐκ περιττοῦ πρόσκειται θηρώμενος μόνον τὸν παρὰ τῶν θεατῶν ἔπαινον. Other examples in the prologues of Plautus are *Cist.* 193 sq., *Mil.* 100, *Truc.* 15 (cf. *Amph.* 493). **Saepe...in multis locis**, a pleonastic style of expression that was much in vogue. Cf. 328 *multa multis saepe suasit perperam*, 998 *Vidi ego multa saepe picta.*

45. Cf. Ter. *Hec.* 879 *equidem plus hodie boni Feci inprudens quam sciens ante hunc diem umquam.* **Insciens** (see note on v. 265). **Quis**, in the sense of *aliquis*, is in Plautus normally found only in sentences with *ne*, *si*, *num*, though we have in Terence, e.g. *roget quis* Eun. 511. Some would find in the use of *quis* here a proof that this prologue, or this part of it, is not the work of Plautus. We have however in other passages of Plautus traces of the freer use of *quis*, 'anyone,' e.g. *Most.* 749 *Iam de istis rebus uoster quid sensit senex?*, Pseud. 29 *An, opsecro hercle, habent quas*

[redacted]

vv. 46—51. *secl. Schoellius post Lorenzium* (*vv.* 46—49) *in Philol. t.* xxx *p.* 432 *sq.*, *Guietum* (*v.* 48), *Fleckeisenum* (*v.* 51) *in epist. crit. p.* 20.

---

gallinae manus?, Asin. 717 *an quid est homini Salute melius?*, Men. 664 *quando quid tibi erit surruptum domo.*

46—51. Some or all of these lines have been bracketed by various editors, but without good reason. It cannot indeed be denied that our MSS. frequently exhibit two versions of the same passage, one of which originated from a later representation of a play (see note on vv. 1016 sqq.). Thus the *Poenulus* contains two versions of the Carthaginian passage (vv. 930—9 and 940—9) and two versions of the end of the same play. In the case of some dittographies we can see that the one version was adopted to the exclusion of the other in an early edition or recension of Plautus. For example, one of the rival versions of the Carthaginian passage (vv. 930—9) is omitted in the Ambrosian Palimpsest. More commonly however both versions are found incorporated in our MSS., though there are often indications that the one was that adopted by the ancient recension which the archetype of the MSS. follows, while the other was subsequently jotted on the margin, and only in process of time found its way from the margin into the text. (See Introd. i. § 17.)

Another kind of marginal adscript that was liable to be found in ancient copies of Plautus may be exemplified from the curious history of an English play, *Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt*, by Massinger and Fletcher. At a passage which strongly suggested Milton's line "That last infirmity of noble mind," an editor had jotted this line in the margin. This jotting the printer incorporated with the text, so that the passage appears in this edition in this form:

"Read but o'er the stories
Of men most famed for courage or for counsaile,
And you shall find that the desire of glory
(That last infirmity of noble minds)
Was the last frailty which men e'er put off."

A line like v. 48 excites the suspicion that it is a parallel passage, taken from a similar situation in another play and jotted in the margin of some early text, whether by a private owner for his own convenience or by an editor for the information of readers; for marginal adscripts, it must be remembered, corresponded to the foot-notes in modern editions. On the other hand, if we picture to ourselves the circumstances under which the prologue to this play would be spoken and remember that the garrulous prolixity of Plautus, the *non astrictus soccus* for which Horace censures him, was in cases like this the only means of impressing on an unintellectual and heedless audience some important incident of a complicated plot, we shall feel it to be the safer course to leave the passage as it stands in the MSS.

Sed inscientes sua sibi fallacia
Ita compararunt et confinxerunt dolum
Itaque hi conmenti de sua sententia,
Vt in seruitute hic ad suum maneat patrem.
Ita nunc ignorans suo sibi seruit patri.

---

46. fallatia *libri* (-ci- *J*) 47. compararunt *libri* (cōp. *DV*) confixerunt *VJ* 48. conmenti *E*: cōmenti *BDV*: commenti *J* 50. seruit *ex* seruio *D*

---

46. **Sua sibi.** See note on v. 5.

47. **Confinxerunt.** Cf. v. 35.

48. **Hi** belongs also to v. 47 by the common figure of speech styled ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. Other examples with the Demonstrative are: *Pseud.* 597 *quoi iussit Symbolum me ferre et hoc argentum*; Bacch. 984 *Tacitus conscripsit tabellas, consignatas mi has dedit.* (A fuller list in Leo *Anal. Plaut.* i.) **Conmenti,** sc. *sunt.* So, e.g. *redditae* Trin. 426, *emortui* 535. **De sua sententia,** 'at their own suggestion,' emphasizes the notion conveyed in vv. 44—5, 51, that the Captives are the uninspired, unconscious agents of a result which they never foresaw. This is the sense of the phrase in its other occurrence in Plautus, *Bacch.* 1038 *Neque ego haud committam ut, si quid peccatum siet, Fecisse dicas de mea sententia,* 'at my prompting.' Leo's punctuation, *itaque hi commenti, de sua sententia ut in servitute,* &c. would be more suitable, if *de sua sententia* could mean 'in their opinion,' to be taken closely with *in servitute,* 'to be a slave, as they imagine,' though really to be acknowledged as the son of the house.

49. **Vt in seruitute,** to be scanned *ut ĭn séruitúte.* That *i* of *in* was pronounced as a long vowel before a following *s*, *f*, we know from Cicero *Orator* xlviii. 159: *quid vero hoc elegantius, quod non fit natura sed quodam instituto? 'Indoctus' dicimus brevi prima littera, 'insanus' producta, 'inhumanus' brevi 'infelix' longa; et, ne multis, quibus in verbis eae primae litterae sunt, quae in 'sapiente' atque 'felice,' producte dicitur, in ceteris omnibus breviter.* The examples in Plautus of the shortening of *in* before *s*, *f* under the Law of Breves Breviantes are very few, e.g. *Stich.* 577 *lúpum ĭn sermóne* (cf. *Cist.* 21, *Pseud.* 594?). **Hic,** rather *hĭc*, 'this one,' than *hīc*, 'in this house.' **Ad** for *apud*, as in v. 699 *meus sodalis Philocrates In libertate est ad patrem in patria,* and elsewhere.

50. **Ignorans.** Unless this part of the prologue is post-Plautine, we must understand *eum.* For *ignoro* is with Plautus a verb of transitive force, e.g. v. 434 *Ne tu me ignores,* 560 *suom ipse interdum ignorat nomen,* 566 *Quem uides, eum ignoras.* **Suo sibi seruit patri**; cf. v. 5.

Homunculi quanti sunt, cum recogito!
Haec res agetur nobis, uobis fabula.
Sed etiam est, paucis uos quod monitos uoluerim.
Profecto expediet fabulae huic operam dare:
Non pertractate facta est neque item ut ceterae;

---

52. Hec *BJ* 54. fabule hinc *J* 55. ceterae *D*: caeterae *BJ*: cetere *VE*

---

51. "Lord, what fools these mortals be!" Cf. *Rud.* 154 *Homunculi quanti estis*, where the sentiment is evoked by the sight of a shipwrecked crew struggling in the waters; Petron. 34 *Eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est!*

52. "He begins by saying, 'this is the matter (*res*) which we are going to act,' then, thinking of the other meaning of *res* and punning upon the double sense of *fabula* (1. 'play,' 2. 'fiction'), he adds, 'but to you it will not be a reality, but a story or fiction.'" Hallidie. Lessing wished to make *nobis* and *uobis* in this line change places.

53. **Vos quod.** The normal order would be *quod uos* (cf. vv. 834, 939, 1004). **Monitos uoluerim.** Cf. v. 309 *Hegio, hoc te monitum, nisi forte ipse non uis, uoluerim* (MSS. *-ram*).

54. **Expediet.** This use of the verb is not found in Plautus, with whom *expedio* means generally 'I explain,' but often 'I disentangle,' 'release' (e.g. v. 454, *Epid.* 86 *me expeditum ex impedito faciam*; cf. Ter. *Hec.* 297 *inpeditum in ea expediui animum meum*), and sometimes as a Neuter Verb 'I turn out,' 'result' (e.g. *Amph.* 521 *Nequiter paene expediuit prima parasitatio*). In *Trin.* 236 the context requires this last sense: *omnium primum Amoris artes eloquar quem ad modum [se] expediant*, 'how they turn out,' 'what they result in.' But in Terence the sense of 'to be expedient' is found, e.g. *Hec.* prol. 57 *mihique ut discere Nouas expediat posthac pretio emptas meo.*

55. The *Captivi* is recommended as a moral play; the *Asinaria* as a witty one (*Asin.* prol. 13 *Inest lepos ludusque in hac comoedia, Ridicula res est*); the *Hautontimorumenos* for its diction (*Haut.* prol. 46 *In hac est pura oratio*). This practice of 'puffing one's wares' in the prologue seems to have been widely spread among Comedians. A grammarian quotes in illustration of the Old Latin adverb *prime* a line from the prologue of Naevius' 'Acontizomenos': *Acontizomenos fabula est prime proba.* The epilogue to the *Captivi* repeats the recommendation, vv. 1029 sqq.:

> Spectatores, ad pudicos mores facta haec fabula est,
> ...Huius modi paucas poetae reperiunt comoedias,
> Ubi boni meliores fiant.

Neque spurcidici insunt uersus inmemorabiles:
Hic neque periurus leno est nec meretrix mala
Neque miles gloriosus: ne uereamini,

56. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 588 'neque—inmemorabiles' spurcidiei *J* inmemorabiles *V*: imm- *BDEJ* 57. Hic (c *e corr.*) *J* 58. gloriosus esse ne B^1*DVEJ*: esse *del.* B^3 (*cf. v.* 59)

Pertractate, 'in the hackneyed fashion' (*item ut ceterae*), with the stock characters of vv. 57—8. We have the Adj.-Part. *pertractatus*, e.g. in Cic. *Div.* i. 56 *qui cursum rerum, euentorumque consequentiam diuturnitate pertractata notauerunt*, so that there is no room for Valla's emendation *Nam pertractate facta est*, 'for it has been composed with the greatest care' (cf. critical note on v. 185). Still the word is not one that we should expect to find in Plautus.

56. **Spurcidici.** We have another Compound in *Trin.* 826 *Neptune, ...te omnes saeuomque seuerumque atque auidis moribus commemorant, Spurcificum, immanem, intolerandum, uesanum.* **Inmemorabiles**, 'that one must not repeat' (cf. *nec bellum est nec memorabile* Curc. 8). In *Cist.* 538 the Verbal Adj. has an active sense, 'refusing to tell': *moderatrix <linguae> fuit atque immemorabilis.* This is a common type of Verbal Adj. in the time of Plautus. To later critics it appeared uncouth, and lends Persius occasion for a sneer at Pacuvius (i. 77):

Sunt quos Pacuviusque et verrucosa moretur
Antiopa, aerumnis cor luctificabile fulta.

But it came into fashion again after Hadrian's time.

57—8. **Periurus leno**, as Ballio in the *Pseudolus*. **Meretrix mala**, as Phronesium in the *Truculentus*. **Miles gloriosus**, as Pyrgopolinices in the *Miles*. The stock-characters of the New Comedy are enumerated by Terence in the prologue to the *Eunuchus* (vv. 35 sqq.):

Quod si personis isdem huic uti non licet,
Qui magis licet currentem seruom scribere,
Bonas matronas facere, meretrices malas,
Parasitum edacem, gloriosum militem,
Puerum supponi, falli per seruom senem,
Amare, odisse, suspicari? denique
Nullumst iam dictum quod non sit dictum prius,

and by Apuleius *Florida* III. xvi. 64 Hild.: *leno periurus et amator feruidus et seruulus callidus et amica illudens et uxor inhibens et mater indulgens et patruus obiurgator et parentes tenaces et meretrices procaces.*

58—9. Cf. v. 24. Notice the different scansion c(*um*) *Aleis* in this line. **Ne uereamini** is spoken ironically, as we see from v. 61.

[redacted]

Quia bellum Aetolis esse dixi cum Aleis:
Foris illi[c] extra scenam fient proelia.
Nam hoc paene iniquomst, comico choragio
Conari desubito agere nos tragoediam.

---

59. Quia *ex* Qua *V* esse dixi B^3: dix (*om.* esse) B^1DVE: dixi (*om.* esse) *J* alidis *libri* (*ex* aliis *V*), *etiam T* 60. fiant *B* praelia *V*: prelia *EJ*: p̄lia *B* 61. paene *V*: pene *BDE* (*J n.l.*) iniquomst *BD*: inquomst V^1E: iniquom est *J*: inquom est V^2 62. desubito agere nos *Bothius*: desubito nos agere B^3: desubitontos agere B^1D: desubi tontos age V^1: desubitontos age V^2E: desubitoneos agere *J* tragoediam *DJ*: tragoeidiam *BVE*

Nothing pleased a Roman audience better than the scenic representation of war with all its paraphernalia. Cf. Hor. *Epp.* II. i. 189 sqq. (quoted in note on v. 62).

60. Since mediaeval scribes and ancient copyists too made a practice of changing the Old Latin Adverb *illi* into *illic*, whenever the context made it clear that the Adverb and not the Dat. Sg. of the Pronoun was in question, we need have no scruples about writing *illi* for *illic* of the MSS. here and in many other passages. It is probable, though not certain, that the scansion *forīs illi éxtra scénam* suits the line better, for *foris*, being emphatic (cf. v. 136), should not be 'in thesi,' and *illic* was accented on the final syllable. The speaker points to his right as he says these words, for the stage-door on his right hand (i.e. on the spectator's left) was the conventional *aditus a peregre.* Thus in the *Amphitruo* when Sosia comes in from the harbour, Mercury says (v. 333) *Hinc enim mihi dextrā uox auris, ut uidetur, uerberat.* (See above, p. 112.) **Scenam,** the spelling in the archetype of our MSS., may be a mere error, like *questoribus* (v. 111) &c. *Scaena* is the normal spelling; still Varro (*L. L.* vii. 96) tells us that Accius spelt the word in the Greek fashion with the single vowel.

61. *Choragium*, 'instrumentum scenarum' (Paul. Fest. 36. 34 Th.), is one of the numerous Greek words in the diction of the Roman theatre (cf. *πάλιν*, 'encore,' *Trin.* 705; *πάντες*, 'the whole troupe,' a stage-direction at the end of the *Persa* in the 'Palatine' recension). On inscriptions of the Empire we find mention of an official of the Imperial Theatre, the *procurator summi choragii.*

62. The traditional reading *desubito nos agere tragoediam* could be allowed only with the doubtful scansion *ágere trăgŏediam* (the contrast between *comico* and *tragoediam* being emphasized in pronunciation by throwing the stress of the voice on the first syllable of *tragoediam* to the detriment of the second). For while a tribrach may be divided between two

Proin si quis pugnam expectat, litis contrahat:
Valentiorem nactus aduersarium
Si erit, ego faciam ut pugnam inspectet non bonam,
Adeo ut spectare postea omnis oderit.
Abeo. Valete, iudices iustissimi

---

63. *versum om.* B^1, *suppl.* B^3 expectat B^3D (p *ex* s): expetat *VE*: exspectat *J* contraat *DEV*^{1} 65. fatiam *E* 67. Valete *B*

---

words in this way, an anapaest (*-rĕ trăgōē-*) may not (see Introd. iii. § 9). But transposition of neighbouring words is perhaps the commonest error of MSS., and the corruption *desubitontos* (P^{BD}) or *desubitoneos* (P^E) may have arisen from a mark in the Archetype put above *nos* to indicate that this word should follow *agere*. The imposing stage-apparatus of the Roman tragedy is mentioned by Cicero *Fam.* VII. i. 2: *quid enim delectationis habent sescenti muli in Clytaemestra? aut in Equo Troiano creterrarum tria milia? aut armatura varia peditatus et equitatus in aliqua pugna? quae popularem admirationem habuerunt, delectationem tibi nullam attulissent*, and by Horace *Epp.* II. i. 189 sqq.:

Quattuor aut plures aulaea premuntur in horas,
Dum fugiunt equitum turmae peditumque catervae;
Mox trahitur manibus regum fortuna retortis,
Esseda festinant, pilenta, petorrita, naves,
Captivum portatur ebur, captiva Corinthus.

63. **Proin,** *dein* are the forms used by Plautus before a consonant, *proinde*, *deinde* before a vowel-initial (e.g. v. 488) or 'in pausa' (e.g. *Poen.* 655 *Quid deínde? Sermonēm ībi nobiscum oṓpulat*); so that the short forms appear to have been produced by that dropping of final *ĕ* in pronunciation which produced the by-forms *nec*, *ac*, *neu*, *seu*, &c. (see note on v. 314 and cf. Introd. ii. § 14). **Litis contrahat:** *Cas.* 561 *Nam ego aliquid contrahere cupio litigi inter eos duos.*

67. **Iudices iustissimi domi.** The spectators' verdict decided or influenced the awarding of prizes to the actors, a fact to which numerous allusions are made in Plautus' prologues, e.g. *Amph.* prol. 16 *Itaque aequi et iusti hic eritis omnes arbitri*, ib. 67—80, *Cas.* prol. 1—2 *Saluere iubeo spectatores optumos, Fidem qui facitis maxumi, et uos Fides*; Poen. prol. 36—8:

Quodque ad ludorum curatores attinet,
Ne palma detur quoiquam artifici iniuria
Neue ambitionis causa extrudantur foras,
Quo deteriores anteponantur bonis.

Domi duellique duellatores optumi.

---

68. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 64 'domi belliqne duellatores optimi' duellique *Lambinus*: belliqne *libri* duellares optimi *J* *Post v.* 68 *quinque versus uacuos reliquit B, unum D.*

---

68. **Duellique duellatores optumi.** Allusion to a current war is of course an absolute necessity for a theatrical representation, ancient or modern. It is a feature of Plautus' prologues, the most detailed example being *Cist.* prol. 197 sqq. (spoken by the god Auxilium):

> bene ualete et uincite
> Virtute uera, quod fecistis antidhac;
> Seruate uostros socios, ueteres et nouos,
> Augete auxilia uostra iustis legibus,
> Perdite perduelles, parite laudem et lauream,
> Ut uobis uicti Poeni poenas sufferant.

Initial *du-* had changed in pronunciation to *b-* before this time. Duellius, the consul of 260 B.C., assumed the new form of the family-name, Bellius (Cic. *Orat.* lv. 153). *Duonus*, the older form of *bonus*, appears only in Saturnian poetry, e.g. *Simul duona eorum portant ad nauis*; while *duis*, class. Lat. *bis*, belongs to the old legal phraseology. In Plautus the old spelling *duellum* is given, at least normally, a disyllabic pronunciation (*Amph.* 189 is a doubtful exception), and *perduellis* a trisyllabic. (Cf. Introd. ii. § 15.) Trisyllabic *duellum* is an archaism of the Epic poetry of Ennius and his imitators, from whom Horace derives his predilection for this form.

Ergasilvs parasitus.

Act I. Scene i. Our division of the plays into numbered Acts and Scenes dates only from the Renaissance editions, and though useful for purposes of reference should not have any prominence assigned to it. In the ancient recensions the only division was that indicated by the scene-headings. These were written as a rule in two lines, the name of the speaker in the first and his 'rôle' in the second, e.g.

ERGASILVS
PARASITVS.

In a very early archetype of the 'Palatine' recension the first lines of these scene-headings had been lost, though they were in most cases supplied by conjecture in a later copy (see Introd. i. § 14). That is why our MSS. here offer only the title of the rôle, PARASITVS. Often however the scene-headings seem to have occupied one line, instead of two, and to have comprised only the proper names, not the rôles (e.g. III. ii.?, iii.?, iv.?, v.?, IV. iv., v. i., iii., iv.).

Ergasilus, the parasite[1], comes on the stage, looking very lean and woe-begone (cf. vv. 91 sqq., 133 sqq.), and laments the absence of his young patron Philopolemus, with its attendant inconveniences for himself.

This opening scene curiously resembles that of the *Menaechmi*, whose prologue too, as already mentioned (p. 115), with its laboured explanation of a somewhat intricate plot, reminds us of the prologue to the *Captivi*. The parasite in the *Menaechmi* begins, like Ergasilus, with an avowal of his nickname:

Iuuentus nomen fecit Peniculo mihi,
Ideo quia mensam, quando edo, detergeo,

and goes on to suggest that the most binding fetters for a prisoner in the 'ergastulum' would be a good dinner:

Esca atque potione uinciri decet.
Apud mensam plenam homini rostri deliges.

He mentions the bounty of the 'adulescens' Menaechmus (as Ergasilus praises Philopolemus), to which however he has recently been a stranger:

[1] Ribbeck's article in the *Abhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft* 1884 is the best account of the parasite-rôle in Roman Comedy.

Iuuentus nomen indidit 'Scorto' mihi,
Eo quia inuocatus soleo esse in conuiuio.
Scio absurde dictum hoc derisores dicere,
At ego aio recte. Nam scortum in conuiuio

I. i. PARASITVS (*om.* ERGASILVS) *libri* (*unius v. sp. D*) 69. Nuentus *c. spat. init.* V^1E: Inuentus V^2J *ut vid.* indidit scorto *ex* scorti indidit *D* scorto (*v. l.* -tum) *J* michi *E* 70. inconuiuio *ex* incon uiuo *J* 71. absurde *ex* absub- *E* 72. aio *Camerarius*: clio B^1D (*cum glossematis notula*): dico (*tanquam glossema*) B^3: dio V^1E: dico V^2J inuiuio J^1

Sed mi interuallum iam hos dies multos fuit:
Domi domatus sum usque cum caris meis. (Cf. *Capt.* 84.)
Nam neque edo neque emo nisi quod est carissumum

(cf. *Capt.* 178); and states that he is on his way to his patron's house:

Nunc ad eum inuiso. Sed aperitur ostium:
Menaechmum eccum ipsum uideo: progreditur foras.

The resemblance to the *Captivi* is so striking, that if the theory be true that the rôle of Ergasilus was added to the piece by Plautus, with the view of enlivening the 'stataria fabula,' one would be inclined to guess that he had taken the parasite in the Greek original of the *Menaechmi* for his model.

69. Antiphanes *Com.* frag. 195, 10 K. *καὶ καλοῦσί μ' οἱ νεώτεροι Διὰ ταῦτα πάντα 'Σκηπτόν.'* Aristophon *Com.* frag. 4, 2 K. *Ἂν τις ἑστιᾷ, πάρειμι πρῶτος, ὥστ' ἤδη πάλαι...'Ζωμὸς' καλοῦμαι.* **Scorto.** The Dative (cf. vv. 726, 820, 984) is normal in phrases of this type in Plautus, the rare instances of the Nom. being either of doubtful genuineness or accounted for by some variation of the expression: *Trin.* 889 *Pax, id est nomen mihi*, Aul. 164 *Quid dubitas, quin sit paratum nomen puero Postumus?* (v. l. '*Postume*'), *Truc.* prol. 12 *Hic habitat mulier nomen cui est Phronesium*, Rud. prol. 32 *Primumdum huic esse nomen urbi Diphilus Cyrenas uoluit*, Mil. prol. 86 *Ἀλαζὼν graece huic nomen est comoediae* (cf. *Amph.* prol. 19). (See note on v. 285.)

70. **Inuocatus.** The pun was probably not taken from the Greek original, for *ἄκλητος* has not the sense of 'invoked' as well as of 'uninvited.' The Greek simile for an uninvited guest was 'a fly,' *μυῖα*, e.g. Antiphanes frag. 195, 7 K. *δειπνεῖν ἄκλητος μυῖα* (cf. id. frag. 230).

71. **Derisores,** "'jeering or jesting parasites,' who earned their meals by their witticisms and by making fun of others; cf. Hor. *Epp.* I. xviii. 11 *imi derisor lecti.*" Hallidie. **Absurde dictum,** "'a very inappropriate nickname,' referring to his unattractive appearance." Hallidie.

72. **At ego aio recte.** Cf. v. 710. The mistakes of the MSS. seem

Sibi amator, talos quom iacit, scortum inuocat.
Estne inuocatum <scortum> an non? Planissume;
Verum hercle uero nos parasiti planius,
Quos numquam quisquam neque uocat neque inuocat.

---

73. talås *D* cum V^2J iaut V^1 74. <scortum> *Bentleius* planissume *ex* -nus- *B ut vid.*: planissime *J* 75. Verum hercle uerum *libri*

---

to be due merely to the word *aio* in the archetype having been written with a type of *a* that is common in early minuscule (see note on v. 202); possibly to the suprascript gloss *dico*, the usual gloss on the word (cf. Nonius p. 70 M. '*Aiat*' *quod est dicat*. Similarly in Terence *Phorm.* 768 *quod aiunt* has become in the Bembinus *quod dicunt*).

73. As in the *Asinaria* vv. 904 sqq.:

> *A.* Iace, pater, talos, ut porro nos iaciamus. *B.* Maxime.
> 'Te, Philaenium, mihi atque uxoris mortem!' Hoc Venerium est.
> Pueri, plaudite et mi ob iactum cantharo mulsum date,

and in the *Curculio* vv. 355 sqq.:

> *A.* Prouocat me in aleam, ut ego ludam: pono pallium;
> Ille suom anulum opposiuit, inuocat Planesium.
> *B.* Meosne amores?

Cf. *Asin.* 780 *Cum iaciat* (sc. *talos*), '*te*' *ne dicat: nomen nominet*. The Scholiast on Horace *C.* I. iv. 18, *Nec regna uini sortiere talis*, uses in illustration these passages of the *Captivi* and *Asinaria*. The repetition of the word *scortum* is a successful touch in the picture, in the manner of Horace's *ad arma cessantes ad arma concitet*.

74. Bentley's stop-gap is more in keeping with the tone of the passage and makes the corruption more easily accounted for than the *an non* *<est? est> planissume* of Camerarius; although it is true that it is Plautus' habit to repeat the verb in such phrases with *an non*, e.g. *Trin.* 1071 *estne ipsus an non est? is est*, Pseud. 616 *Esne tu an non es ab illo militi Macedonio?* Cf. Terence *Eun.* 546 *is est an non est?* Terence usually does not repeat, e.g. *Hec.* 509 *uelitne an non*, Phorm. 852 *Sed isne, est quem quaero an non? ipsust* (see note on v. 846). **Planissume**, so *Pseud.* 365.

75. **Verum hercle uero**, also *Curc.* 375. Similarly *uerum enim uero* Capt. 999.

76. **Numquam quisquam** (cf. v. 136), a favourite expression with Plautus, e.g. *Pseud.* 134, 507, 1018, *Rud.* 218, 581, 790, *Trin.* 237, 574, 801. **Numquam...neque...neque.** This series of Negatives is more in the manner of later diction (e.g. Cic. *Att.* XIV. XX. 3 *nemo umquam neque poeta*

[redacted]

Quasi mures semper edimus alienum cibum:
Vbi res prolatae sunt, qum rus homines eunt,
Simul prolatae res sunt nostris dentibus.
Quasi, cum caletur, cocleae in occulto latent,

---

77. *versum secl. Spengelius Philol. t.* xxxvii *p.* 421 cybum *BV* (*ex* cib-) 78. prolate *EJ* qum *BD*: quin *ex* qum *E*: quin V^1: cum V^2 *ut vid. J* 80. *versum laudat Macrobius exc. Bob.* (*Gr. lat. vol.* v) *p.* 648, 14 *K.* 'quasi cum—latent' Quas V^1 cococleae B^2: cocleo B^1DVEJ: cocli... *Macrobius* inoculto *V*

---

neque orator fuit). But cf. *Epid.* 110 *At pudicitiae eius numquam nec uim nec uitium attuli.*

77. This verse recurs in the monologue of the parasite in the *Persa* v. 58:

Pater, auos, proauos, abauos, atauos, tritauos
Quasi mures semper edere alienum cibum.

Spengel brackets it here as a marginal adscript (see note on vv. 46—51), on the strength of its inconsistency with v. 76. But this severely critical method of dealing with a Comedian's jokes may lead us astray as often as not. **Quasi mures.** Diogenes Laertius (vi. 40) tells us a story of Diogenes the Cynic: πρὸς τοὺς ἑρπύσαντας ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν μῦς, 'ἰδοὺ,' φησί, 'καὶ Διογένης παρασίτους τρέφει.' **Alienum cibum.** *Pers.* 337 *Quamquam libenter escis alienis studes.*

78. **Vbi res prolatae sunt,** 'in Vacation.' 'After Vacation' is *quando res redierunt* (v. 86), *cum res rediissent* Cic. *Or. post Red.* i. 11, 27. Cf. *ad res redeuntes* (*venire*) Cic. *Sest.* 62, 129. **Qum.** See note on v. 143.

80—81. Symmachus *Epist.* i. 33 (27), p. 18, 26 Se.: *Aiunt cocleas cum sitiunt* <*vitio*> *aeris atque illis de caelo nihil liquitur, suco proprio victitare,* perhaps a reminiscence of this line. So St Jerome *Epist.* cvii. 10: *Saecularis homo in Quadragesima ventris ingluviem decoquit, et in cochlearum morem succo victitans suo, futuris dapibus ac saginae aqualiculum parat.*

80. **Quasi** in actual (not imaginary) comparisons is an Early Latin use, e.g. *Asin.* 178, *Pseud.* 199, *Trin.* 835. Cicero imitates this usage in *Senect.* 19, 71 *quasi poma ex arboribus vix evelluntur* (spoken by Cato the Elder). **Caletur,** 'it is warm,' the Plautine expression, as in *Truc.* 65 *cum caletur maxime,* whereas *calet* in Plautus always has a definite subject (e.g. *os calet tibi* Rud. 1326, *at enim nihil est, nisi dum calet hoc agitur* Poen. 914). The Impersonal Passive, that peculiarly Latin construction, which so puzzled the Grammarians of the Empire (Quint. i. 4. 28 iam 'itur in antiquam silvam' nonne propriae cuiusdam rationis est? nam quod initium eius invenias? cui simile 'fletur'), is very common in the older

Suo sibi suco uiuont, ros si non cadit,
Item parasiti rebus prolatis latent
In occulto miseri, uictitant suco suo,
Dum ruri rurant homines quos ligurriant.
Prolatis rebus parasiti uenatici [canes]
Sumus, quando res redierunt, Molossici

---

81. uiuunt V^2: inuunt *J ut vid.* **83.** *Post* miseri *distinxerunt Camerarius Lambinusque, ante* miseri *Gruterus* Inoculto *V* uiocitant V^1E suo suco *B* **84.** *versum laudat Nonius p.* 164, 20 *M.* (*s. v.* rurant) 'dum—ligurriant' ruri *om. Nonius* **85.** uenatici (-ci *ex* -q) *D* [canes] *Pylades* **86.** *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 339 'quando res redierit molosisci sumus' redierunt (*vel* -re) <tum> *Schoellius*, redierunt <sumus> *Birtius*, redierunt canes (*cf. v.* 85) *Niemeyerus*

---

writers. Cf. *Pseud.* 273 A. *Quid agitur, Calidore?* B. *Amatur atque egetur acriter.* **Cŏclea,** 3-syll., not 'coculea,' is the Plautine form (*Poen.* 532). The spelling with *-ea* is approved by the authorities on Orthography (*Probi Appendix*, p. 198 K.: cochlea non 'coclia'). **In occulto latent,** again in v. 165 (with the scansion *in ŏccúlto*).

81. **Suo sibi.** See note on v. 5; and for the Asyndeton cf. v. 436. **Ros si non cadit.** Cf. Varro *R. R.* iii. 17 *locus* (for rearing snails) *est melior quem et non coquit sol et tangit ros....Paruos iis cibus opus est.*

83. **Victitant.** The Frequentative form of this, as of other Verbs, is very common in Plautus, e.g. *Mil.* 321 (*lolio*), *Poen.* 397 (*sorbilo*), *Rud.* 764 (*ficis*), *Truc.* 315 (*sinapi*).

84. **Rurant.** The Deponent form would be more normal. It is used by Varro *Menipp.* 457 B. *dum in agro studiosius ruror.* But the Verb adopted by Cicero and subsequent writers is *rusticor.* In *Men.* 105 *Domi domatus sum usque cum caris meis* (MSS. *domitus*) we seem to have the same formation from *domus* as *ruror* from *rus.*

85. **Venatici.** Cicero *Verr.* iv. 14. 31 similarly characterizes the agents of Verres: *mirandum in modum—canis venaticos diceres—ita odorabantur omnia et peruestigabant, ut ubi quidque esset aliqua ratione inuenirent* (cf. *Mil.* 268). Our MSS. add the word *canes*, which some editors would prefix to v. 86 *Canĕs sŭmus, quandŏ* &c. Niemeyer inserts it between *redierunt* and *molossici.* It is as likely to have been a gloss wrongly inserted in the text.

86. Schoell's insertion of *tum*, Birt's of *sumus*, Niemeyer's of *canes* before *molossici* would dispense with the awkward rhythm of the first part of the line. For the isolation of the Substantive Verb at the beginning of a line, cf. e.g. v. 884 *quia enim item asperae Sunt*, Truc. 28 *quot illic*

Odiosicique et multum incommodestici.
Et hic quidem hercle, nisi qui colaphos perpeti
Potes parasitus frangique aulas in caput,

---

87. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 388 'odiosici sunt,' inquit, 'et multum inconmodestici' Odiosici quae *DV*¹*E* incomodestici *libri* 88. hercle (h *nunc eras.*) *D* colophos *J* 89. Potest *J*: Potis *Camerarius* frangitque *V*²*J* aulos *B*¹ (*corr. B*³) capud *DE*

---

iracundiae Sunt, Pseud. 541 *quis me audacior Sit, si istuc facinus audeam?*, *Most.* 159 A. *Euentus rebus omnibus, uelut horno messis magna Fuit.* B. *Quid ea messis attinet ad meam lauationem?* **Res redierunt** (see note on v. 78). **Molossici.** The *canes Molossi* are often mentioned by Latin writers, not only as watch-dogs for the house, e.g. Hor. *S.* II. vi. 114 *domus alta Molossis Personuit canibus*, Lucr. v. 1063, but also as sheep-dogs, e.g. Hor. *Epod.* vi. 5 *Nam qualis aut Molossus aut fulvus Lacon, Amica uis pastoribus*, and (as in this line) as dogs of the chase, e.g. Lucan iv. 440 *Venator tenet ora levis clamosa Molossi*, Stat. *Ach.* ii. 73 *multo legit arva Molosso Venator*, Mart. XII. i. 1 *Retia dum cessant latratoresque Molossi, Et non invento silva quiescit apro*, &c.

87. **Odiosici...incommodestici** are, like *Molossici*, comic coinages on the type of *uenatici* (v. 85). The verb *graecissat* is similarly echoed in *Men.* prol. 11—12 *Atque adeo hoc argumentum graecissat, tamen Non atticissat uerum sicilicissitat* (cf. note on v. 767). **Multum** (see note on v. 272).

89. To retain *potes* of the MSS., understanding *nisi qui* as εἰ μή πως, with *qui* Adv., and *potes* indefinite, 'one can,' is of doubtful expediency. *Si qui* (Adv.) is normally accompanied by a Comparative, e.g. *Trin.* 120 *Si qui probiorem facere posses* (see note on v. 553). And the Subjunctive is used with this indefinite 2 Pers. Sing. in v. 221 (see note) and elsewhere. If *potes* is a corruption, the 'lectio difficilior' *potis* is preferable to *potest.* Leo takes exception to the ictus *potis* (found also in *Mil.* 781; cf. 788. See Introd. ii. § 3). **Frangi aulas in caput** is, like *colaphos*, governed by *perpeti.* Cf. *Poen.* 313 A. *At ego amo hanc.* B. *At ego esse et bibere.* The parasite in Aristophon *Com.* fr. 4 K. describes himself as ὑπομένειν πληγὰς ἄκμων, and the parasite, Curculio, speaks of 'aulae quassae' as missiles frequently aimed at him (*Curc.* 398; cf. *Pers.* 60). So in *Amph.* fr. iii. *Optimo iure infringatur aula cineris in caput.* **Aulas.** The older spelling *aulla* (cf. *auxilla*), with rustic by-form *olla*, became *aula* by the rule of Latin phonetics that a double consonant should be reduced to a single after a diphthong, e.g. *paul(l)um*, *caus(s)a.* The adoption of the rustic form *olla* into literary diction may have been due to the desire to avoid confusion of *aula*, 'hall,' with *aula*, the new form of *aulla.*

Vel ire extra portam Trigeminam ad saccum licet.
Quod mihi ne eueniat non nullum periculum est.
Nam postquam meus rex est potitus hostium—

---

90. poram *B*[1] (*corr. B*[2]) trigeminam (g *ante* t *incohata*) *D* sacculum *VEJ* Vel extra p. T. ad s. ilicet *Bothius* 91. Quot *B*[1]*DV*[1]*E* : Quod *B*[2]*V*[2]*J* michi *E* ne eueniat *ex* ne eui- *B* : nec ueniat *D* periculum *ex* periclum *V* 92. rex potius (*om.* est) *J*

---

90. **Vel**, as in 132, 183. The scansion *uel íre éxtra pórtam* must be excused by the unstressed (enclitic) pronunciation of *ire* in this phrase (cf. our 'to go home,' 'to go back,' with stress on 'home' and 'back'). Even so, the shortening of a naturally long syllable in a word-group of this kind by the Law of Breves Breviantes is abnormal (see Introd. ii. § 21); and Bothe's theory is very attractive, that Plautus wrote *Vel extra—ilicet* (cf. v. 469), which was at some stage or other of the history of the text 'modernized' to *Vel ire extra—licet.* **Portam Trigeminam.** "The *Porta Trigemina* was in the short piece of the wall between the Aventine Mount and the river; through it the road led to Ostia. It was probably so called from having three arches, but it was connected in legend with the Trigemini Horatii." Hallidie. **Saccum** denotes the sack of the porter (*baiulus*), to judge from the resolve of the parasite in Alciphron iii. 7 *ἐπ' ἐργασίαν τρέψομαι καὶ Πειραιάδε βαδιοῦμαι, τὰ ἐκ τῶν νεῶν φορτία ἐπὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας μισθοῦ μετατιθείς.* Others understand a reference to begging, which was practised at the gates of towns, and find a parallel in *Trin.* 423 *Pater quom peregre ueniet, in portast locus* (cf. *thylacistae* Aul. 518, from *θυλακίζω*, to beg, a derivative of *θύλακος*, a bag or pouch). But *saccus* rather suggests a sack carried by a porter (later *saccarius*), than a beggar's wallet. Livy xxxv. 10 (cf. xli. 27) speaks of an *emporium ad Tiberim* which existed *extra portam Trigeminam* as early as 193 B.C. Ergasilus seems to have thought of employment as a porter there.

91. The spondee-word (*nullum*) in the fourth foot injures the rhythm (see note on v. 24 &c.). **Non nullum**, an unusual expression, and one indeed inconsistent with Plautus' use of the double negative in lines like *Rud.* 359 *Nec te aleator nullus est sapientior.* The terms *nonnulli*, *nonnemo*, *nonnihil* &c. came into vogue at a later time. (*Nec nihil* in v. 854, *Nec nihil hodie nec multo plus tu hic edes*, is not an example of this usage.)

92. **Rex** (*βασιλεύς*), the colloquial word for a patron, frequent in the Comedians &c. **Est potitus hostium** (cf. 144, 762, *Epid.* 532 *gnata mea hostiumst potita*), the Passive of *potire aliquem alicuius rei*, e.g. *Amph.* 178 *Eum nunc potiuit pater seruitutis.* The Verb is used of undesirable as well as of good things (cf. Donatus ad Ter. *Phorm.* III. i. 5 = 469 *potiri τῶν μέσων fuit*). Lucr. iv. 766 has *eum mortis letique potitum* (contrast Auson. *Idyl.* xv. 50 *morte potiri*), and the phrase *necis potior* occurs on an epitaph

[redacted]

Ita nunc belligerant Aetoli cum Aleis;
Nam Aetolia haec est, illi[c] est captus in Alide

93. alidis *libri* 94. aeotolia *D*: etolia *E* heo *B*

(*C. I. L.* i. 1011): *Quadraginta annos nata necis potior.* The Deponent (as opposed to the Active and Passive) form is rarer with undesirable things, e.g. *Rud.* 190 *laborem hunc potiri*, Ter. *Phorm.* 469 *ne quid... poteretur mali* (cf. ad v. 218). Ergasilus should go on to say that no substitute for his young patron could be found; but he wanders off into other matters, and does not give us this information till v. 104.

93. Cf. v. 24 and note. **Ita** (see note on v. 674).

94. **Nam Aetolia haec est.** See p. 112. It seems unlikely that we should have in the same line two unpleasing rhythms like *il|lĭc ĕst cáp|tŭs ĭn Á|lide.* 'Illĭc'st' or 'illĭc'st' is a pronunciation that seems not to be recognized by Plautus (Introd. ii. § 12), and it is highly improbable that the last syllable of *captus* could be elided (Introd. ii. § 3). *Illĭc* is not in itself objectionable, for *ille* often is used where *is* would be expected, e.g. *Epid.* 267 *fidicinam Illam, quam is uolt liberare, quae illum conrumpit tibi.* To change the unfamiliar form *illic* into the familiar *ille* is contrary to the laws of textual criticism. But if we remember the tendency of our scribes to change *illi* Adv. to *illic* (see note on v. 60), we shall see that the alteration *illi est captus* involves the least departure from the traditional reading, especially as we have the Adverb in v. 330, a close parallel to this line: *Filius meus illi*[*c*] *apud uos seruit captus Alide.* The end of the line would be most simply emended, if emendation were necessary, by supposing *in* to be a gloss, at first written above *Alide* to explain the unfamiliar use of the Ablative, and subsequently copied into the text. The rule of Classical Latin that the Preposition should be used with names of countries and omitted with names of towns is not strictly followed by Plautus. Thus we have in this play *Alide*, 'in Elis' (v. 330), *Alidem*, 'to Elis' (v. 573), though usually *in Alide* (vv. 9, 26, 544, 547, 590, 638, 973, 979) and *in Alidem* (vv. 379, 588), *ex Alide* (vv. 510, 1005, 1014). Redslob thinks it possible that Plautus thought of Elis as a town and not as a country. A more certain example of the name of a country is *Most.* 440 *Triennio post Aegypto aduenio domum* (cf. *Truc.* 540). Plautus can also dispense with the Preposition in phrases like *saxo saliat* Trin. 265, *officio migrat* Trin. 639. An old inscription of 189 B.C. (*C.I.L.* i. 534) has *Aetolia cepit*, apparently meaning 'took from Aetolia.' And a line quoted from the *Odyssey* of Livius Andronicus by Festus (p. 162, 24 Th.), of text fairly certain, though not above suspicion, has: *Partim errant, nequinont Graeciam redire*, 'they stray in companies and cannot win back to Greece.'

Philopolemus, huius Hegionis filius
Senis, qui hic habitat, quae aedes lamentariae
Mihi sunt, quas quotienscumque conspicio, fleo—,
Nunc hic occepit quaestum hunc fili gratia
Inhonestum et maxime alienum ingenio suo:

---

95. Philopolemeus *DVE*: Philopolomeus *B*: Philopolemus *J* egionis *libri* 96. Seras qui V^2J 97. Michi *EJ* conspitio *libri* (-cio *J*) 98. questum *libri* huc V^1 (*corr.* V^2) filii *libri* gracia *J* 99. *om.* et *B*

---

95. **Huius** (see note on v. 7).

96. **Lamentariae**, a novel formation on the type of *argentarius*, *unguentarius*, *frumentarius*, &c. The suffix *-arius* was much in vogue in early Latin, though later it was often supplanted by *-aris*. *Militarius*, for example, occurs instead of class. *militaris* in *Pseud.* 1048 *Quin hinc metimur gradibus militariis*; *singularius* instead of *singularis* in v. 112 below. *Datarius* is another Plautine coinage; *Stich.* 258 A. *Linguam quoque etiam uendidi datariam.* B. *Nullan tibi lingua est?* A. *Quae quidem dicat* '*dabo.*' So is *manifestarius* for *manifestus*. These forms are suitable for line-endings. A pause would follow, while Ergasilus gave way to his emotion.

98. **Hic.** In classical Latin poetry *hic* Nom. Sg. has acquired the scansion of a long syllable, a phrase like *hic est* being pronounced, as the Grammarians tell us, 'hicc est' (cf. *C.I.L.* ix. 60 *Accessi terras conplures: terminus hicc est*). This pronunciation, which seems to have followed the pronunciation of *hoc* Neut., originally **hod-ce*, then by assimilation *hoc-c(e)* (cf. *hoccine*), cannot be shewn to be as early as Plautus. He seems to know only *hĭc* Nom., *hīc* (*heic*) Adv. (Introd. ii. §§ 5, 32). Here, since the metre requires a long syllable, *hic* must be the Adverb, 'in this house,' the locale of the 'quaestus carcerarius' (v. 129). Schoell proposes *hic* <*homo*>; and *hic* <*hic*> is also conceivable. But no alteration is required. **Occepit quaestum.** Ter. *Andr.* 79, *Adel.* 206. **Quaestum hunc.** Ergasilus points to the Captives (see note on v. 38), who probably have remained on the stage (see note on v. 252).

99. **Et.** Asyndeton is a common feature of the early language, and is so often effaced in our MSS. by a scribe's insertion of *et*, *que*, *atque*, and the like, that one is tempted to adopt here the reading of the Codex Vetus (*B*) and omit *et* (cf. note on v. 718). On the other hand the 'consensus' of *DVE* is proof that *et maxime* was the reading of the common archetype of *BDVE* (Introd. i. § 8), so that the omission of *et* in *B* is not likely to be anything more than a scribe's error. **Alienum ingenio.** The Preposition is found in *Mil.* 1288 *Inhonesta...atque aliena a bonis.* The

[redacted]

Homines captiuos commercatur, si queat
Aliquem inuenire, suum qui mutet filium.
Quod quidem ego nimis quam cupio† ut impetret;
Nam ni illum recipit, nihil est quo me recipiam.

---

100. cap' *post* captiuos *eras. D* comertatur *D*: comercatur *E* 101. qui cummutet *libri*: *corr. Scioppius* *vv.* 102—107, *quos libri praebent post v.* 125, *huc traiecit Acidalius*: *secl. Langius* (*Beitr. p.* 206) 102. <fieri> ut *Schoellius*: <et opto> ut *Niemeyerus* imperet *libri* (-tr- V^2) 103. inillum B^1DV^1E: ni illum B^3V^2J nichil *EJ* quo *ex* quod *D*

---

trade of slave-dealers was considered disreputable and expressly distinguished from that of merchants (*mangones non mercatores sed uenaliciarii appellantur* Dig. 50, tit. 16. 5. 207), though the elder Cato seems not to have shared this view (Plut. *Cat.* 21).

100—1. Cf. vv. 27—28. **Homines captiuos.** *Men.* 79 *Homines captiuos qui catenis uinciunt.* So *homo seruus* or *seruus homo*, *homo amicus*, &c.

101. **Qui mutet.** The *quicummutet* of the MSS. has probably arisen from a suprascript gloss (*qu*)*ocum* explaining *qui* (cf. v. 28), written thus in
ocum
some archetype *qui mutet*, and mistaken for the correction of an omission. This instrumental sense is proper to *qui*, which was probably an old Instrumental (some say Abl., others Loc.) Case of the Relative. Thus *qui* is the Instrumental, corresponding to *ubi*, the Locative Adverb in *Bacch.* 84 '*Dato qui bene sit*': *ego ubi bene sit tibi locum lepidum dabo*, *Epid.* 384 *Non oris causa modo homines aequom fuit Sibi habere speculum, ubi os contemplarent suom, Sed qui perspicere possent cordis copiam.*

102—107. These lines do not stand here in the MSS., but after v. 125, in the middle of Hegio's speech in the next scene. Some editors regard them as a post-Plautine interpolation or alternative passage (see p. 131), entered on the margin of an early recension. But they may have been accidentally omitted (possibly through the Homoeoteleuton *-ium* vv. 101, 108) and afterwards written in the bottom margin of some archetype.

102. **Nimis quam.** *Most.* 511 *nimis quam formido*, Truc. 468 *nimis quam paucae.* The emendation <*cupide*> *cupio* (cf. *Cas.* 267 *quid istuc tam cupide cupis*, and see note on v. 250) is very tempting. But Plautus uses the Inf. with *cupio* (e.g. vv. 399, 856), and never under any circumstances *ut* and Subj. (which is indeed a post-classical construction), so that *eum impetrare* would be required. Unless we are to suppose that the line is of later origin, we cannot consider that *ut impetret* is dependent on *cupio*, and must reject supplements like <*cupide*> *cupio* or *Quod* <*e*>*quidem egŏ* (cf. *Bacch.* 435 *id equidem ego certo scio*).

103. This line gives evidence of a sort on the pronunciation of *nihil*

N<on> ulla est spes iuuentutis; sese omnis amant.
Ille demum antiquis est adulescens moribus,
Cuiius numquam uoltum tranquillaui gratiis.

---

104. *supplevi*: Necullast *Brixius* <in> iuuentuti *Muellerus* 105. adhulescens *B* adolescens est *J* 106. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 586 'cuius numquam uultum tranquillauit' Cui ius DV^1: Cuius *BE*: Cui uis V^2J uolutum *J* tranquillaui gratiis *B*: tranquilla ingratiis *D*: tranquilla (i *ex* l) uigratus V^1: tranquilla ingratus (*ex* -tis) *E*: tranquillauit gratius (*ut. vid.*) V^2: tranquillauit gratiis *J*

---

by Plautus. I fancy that, both *ni* and *illum* being emphatic in this line, the phrase *ni illum* would be trisyllabic, *ní íllum*, in which case the spelling *nil* would not adequately represent the pronunciation of the word. The assonance would be more complete with *ni(h)ilum*.

104. *Nulla ést iuuentutis spes* is unrhythmical; *Nulla iuuentutis spes est*, a too forcible transposition of the order in the MSS. *Neculla* would easily be changed to *nulla*, through a scribe either 'modernizing' the unfamiliar word or mistaking a suprascript gloss for a correction. The evidence however for *necullus* (*Trin.* 282 ?), *necumquam* (*Truc.* 231 ?, *Poen.* 489 ?) is very uncertain in Plautus, though he undoubtedly used the phrase *nec recte dicere*. Mueller proposes *in iuuentuti*, with the ī-form of Abl. Sg. (Introd. ii. § 5) and the construction found in *Pers.* 309 *ecquid estne speculae in te?*, Ter. *Ad.* 455 *in te spes omnis sitast*, &c. The least questionable change, it seems to me, is to suppose that the line began with *Non ulla*, the first word being written in the usual abbreviated form, *N* with a horizontal stroke above the letter. Similarly in *Truc.* 461 I would read *N<on> ullam rem oportet dolose adgrediri* (cf. *Cist.* 223 'neo' P^8 for *non eo*). Bothe changes the order to *nulla iuu. est spes.*

105. **Ille demum**, pronounced *ill' demum* (see Introd. ii. § 14). For the phrase, a common one, cf. v. 1000 *illic ibi demumst locus.* **Antiquis... moribus.** Trin. 295 *Meo modo et moribus uiuito antiquis.*

106. **Cuiius.** The spelling with *-ii-* which, according to the Grammarians, was more in unison with the pronunciation, is often found in good MSS. in the case of words like *cuius*, *eius*, *aio* etc. Cicero favoured this spelling (Vel. Longus vii. 54. 16 K. *in plerisque Cicero videtur auditu emensus scriptionem, qui et 'Aiiacem' et 'Maiiam' per duo i scribenda existimavit*). **Tranquillaui.** This is the only occurrence of this verb in Plautus, who employs usually *tranquillum facere*, e.g. *Poen.* 355 *nisi illam mihi tam tranquillam facis Quam mare olimst, quom ibi alcedo pullos educit suos.* **Gratiis** (later *gratis*) and its opposite *ingratiis* are usually found at the end of the line or hemistich.

[redacted]

Condigne pater est eius moratus moribus.
Nunc ad eum pergam. Sed aperitur ostium,
Unde saturitate saepe ego exii ebrius.

107. est pater *B* 108. hostium *libri* 109. saturitate (*priore* a *in ras.*) *B*: suturitate V^1 (*corr.* V^2) sepe *libri* ebrius *ex* -os *J*

107. **Condigne** has usually (like *commereo*) a bad sense in Plautus, e.g. *Men.* 906 *Condigne autem haec meretrix fecit, ut mos est meretricius* (cf. *Mil.* 505 *Ibi dum condignam te sectatu's simiam*), but not always, e.g. *condigne* Bacch. 392, *condignus* Amph. 537—8. **Moratus moribus**, a favourite phrase: *Asin* 506 *istoc more moratam*, Ter. *Hec.* 644 *sed quid mulieris uxorem habes aut quibus moratam moribus?*, Titin. *Com.* 59 R. *si sitis moratae ambae ibus pro ut ego moribus.*

108. The opening monologue of Peniculus, Ergasilus' counterpart in the *Menaechmi*, is similarly broken off with the line (v. 108): *Nunc ad eum inuiso. Sed aperitur ostium.*

109. On the scansion *und' sáturitate* see Introd. ii. § 14. *Saturitas* is Ergasilus' patron divinity (vv. 877—8):

ita me amabit sancta Saturitas,
Hegio, itaque suo me semper condecoret cognomine,
Ut ego uidi.

Saturitate ebrius. The word *satur* (*saturitas*) is used with reference to drink in *Curc.* 362, and elsewhere, e.g. Mart. iii. 58. 44, Petron. fr. xxix, S. Augustin. *Confess.* vi. 6. 9 (cf. v. 771 below). But perhaps it is *ebrius* in this line, and not *saturitate*, that should not be taken literally. Hallidie compares the humorous misuse of *iugulo* in *Stich.* 581 *ut me hodie iugularem fame.* **Exii** should not be changed to *Exiui* (*Stich.* 459 *Auspicio hodie* <*optume*> *optumo exiui foras*). For *exĭi*, cf. *Pseud.* 1282, a bacchiac line: *Inde húc exíi, crapulám dum amouérem* (*exiui* A, *exi* P) (cf. ad v. 194).

Act I. Scene ii. Hegio, dressed in white (the colour worn by old men in Comedy), comes out of his house accompanied by the overseer of the slaves, who is carrying two light sets of fetters. Going up to the two Captives, he gives orders that they be put in the new fetters with liberty to walk about. As he turns to go away (v. 126), Ergasilus attracts his attention, and the two hold a conversation, in the course of which (v. 167) Hegio announces his plan of exchanging Tyndarus (i.e. the pretended Philocrates) for Philopolemus. After giving Ergasilus an invitation to dinner, Hegio goes back into the house.

The humorous as well as the kindly side of Hegio's character is admirably brought out in this Scene. He clearly is 'condigne moratus moribus'

HEGIO senex. LORARIVS. ERGASILVS parasitus. I. ii.

HEG. Aduorte animum sis : tu istos captiuos duos,
Heri quos emi de praeda de quaestoribus,
Is indito catenas singularias

I. ii. SENEX • LOLARIVS • PARASITVS *BVEJ*: *unius v. spat. D*
110. duorte *c. sp. in* V^1E (a *marg.* V^2) tu : istos *vulg.* 111. emii *D* preda *DEJ* questoribus *libri* de praeda a quaestoribus *Fleckeisenus*
112. His *libri*: *corr. Seyffertus Stud. Plaut. p.* 16 *sq.*

(v. 107) in respect of both his sons, sharing the wit of Tyndarus along with the generosity of Philopolemus.

110. The rhythm of the line is improved by the adoption of the punctuation of B^3, with a stop, not after *tu*, but after *sis*, which brings the metrical ictus into correspondence with what appears to have been the accentuation of the phrase *aduórte-animúm-sis* (cf. *nolí-sis* Cas. 204, *facitó-sis* Poen. 1084). **Istos** might mean merely 'under your charge.' But we may suppose the *lorarius* to go at once and take his stand beside the two Captives, who are still on the stage (see note on v. 252), so that *istos* will mean 'beside you' (see note on v. 38). For the construction see note on v. 1.

111. Cf. v. 34 *Emit hosce de praeda ambos de quaestoribus*, 453 *illos emi de praeda a quaestoribus.* **Heri.** There is no need of writing *here* for the pyrrich form (cf. Quint. I. vii. 22 '*here*' *nunc e littera terminamus: at ueterum comicorum adhuc libris inuenio* '*heri ad me uenit*'). Whether *herĕ*, the form in use in Quintilian's time, was really originally the same by-form of *herī* as *rurĕ* of *rurī* is doubtful, for his description of the final vowel-sound as 'something between *e* and *i*' (I. iv. 8 *in* '*here*' *neque e plane neque i auditur*) corresponds with the usual description of the final vowel-sound of *tibĭ*, *sibĭ*. Like these two pronouns *heri* may well have been originally an iambic word only and have become in course of time a pyrrich word, in which case the spelling *here* would be due to the false analogy of *rurĕ* &c. beside *rurī* &c. A metrical ictus corresponding to the usual ictus in cases of postposition of a Relative (*herí quos emi*) is provided by Fleckeisen's emendation, followed by most editors, *a quaestoribus*, which is defended by the theory that *praeda a* would readily be miscopied *praeda* (like *qui<a> astant* v. 2) and the missing preposition be later supplied by *de*. I do not see that we have sufficient reason for leaving the MSS., especially as the double *de* is found in them also in v. 34 (see note).

112. **Is,** MSS. *his* (see note on v. 2). **Catenas singularias,** separate sets of fetters, to replace the single heavy set with which the

[redacted]

Istas, maiores quibus sunt iuncti demito;
Sinito ambulare, si foris, si intus uolent:
Sed uti adseruentur magna diligentia.

---

113. iuncti *an* uincti *in libris incert. Huic lectioni fauet litterarum ductus in EJ, illi in cett.* (*ex* iuoti *V*) demitto *DE* 114. foris *ex* -res *J* 115. adsentur *J*

Captives were bound together. On *singularius*, class. *singularis*, see note on v. 96. These *catenae* are light enough to allow liberty of motion (v. 114), and they include a *collare* (v. 357).

113. **Istas,** 'which you hold in your hands.' **Iuncti.** The letters *iu* and *ui* are so closely similar in minuscule writing that it is actually not quite certain whether *iuncti* or *uincti* is the reading better supported by our MSS. The sense requires *iuncti* (cf. note on v. 112).

114. **Sinito.** Plautus is so careful in his use of the Fut. Imperative and Pres. Imper. forms (e.g. *Mil.* 522 *heus, Philocomasium, cito Transcurre curriculo ad nos, ita negotiumst. Post, quando exierit Sceledrus a nobis, cito Transcurrito ad uos rursum curriculo domum*) that we must believe that there is a notion of futurity in these orders, though it is more patent in *sinito*, 'allow for the future' (cf. *Trin.* 485 *Semper tu hoc facito, Lesbonice, cogites*), with *uolent* Fut. in the dependent clause, than in the other Future Imperatives *indito* and *demito*. The distinction between them and *aduorte* is little more than would be expressed by 'Look here! I wish these light sets of fetters to be put on the two prisoners and the heavy set to be taken off.' We have similarly a further command put in the Fut. Imper., while the immediate order is in the Pres. Imper., in passages like *Asin.* 740 *Leonida, curre, obsecro: patrem huc orato ut ueniat*, Pseud. 20 *Cape has tabellas: tute hinc narrato tibi*, Pseud. 986 *Nosce imaginem: tute eius nomen memorato mihi.* The command (cf. v. 125 *cura quae iussi*) is apparently carried out with the aid of the assistant *lorarii* at vv. 195 sqq. **Ambulare,** 'to walk about,' the usual sense (cf. v. 12). **Si...si** (*Rud.* 1257 *Si aurum, si argentum est*), usually *si...sive* in Plautus and Terence, and *sive...sive* in Classical Latin. *Si...si* was apparently the oldest form and was used in the religious formula of address to an unknown god, *Si deus, si dea*, e.g. *C. I. L.* i. 632, 1114, Cato *R. R.* 139 (quoted below) &c. The metrical ictus *foris* 'in pausa' has nothing objectionable; see note on v. 60.

115. **Uti,** instead of *ut*, lends impressiveness to the command. *Uti* (whether in the sense of 'in order that' or of 'as') is the form favoured in Laws (e.g. in the S. C. de Bacchanalibus, *C. I. L.* i. 196 of 186 B.C. *Haice utei in couentionid exdeicatis...senatuosque sententiam utei scientes esetis*), Prayers (e.g. in an execration tablet, *C. I. L.* i. 818 *uti semper odio sit*;

Liber captiuos auis ferae consimilis est:
Semel fugiendi si data est occasio,
Satis est, numquam postilla possis prendere.
LOR. Omnis profecto liberi lubentius
Sumus quam seruimus. HEG. Non uidere ita tu quidem.

116. captiuos *J*: captiuus *ceteri* (us *ras. ex* sis *V*) fere *BV* (*alt.* e *ex* a) *E*: ferre *DJ*: *corr. Turnebus Advers.* XXIII. 24 *Lambinusque* 118. nunquam *J* post illam BV^2J 119. *Lorario dedit Pylades, Hegioni continuant libri* Omnes *V* (*ex* -nis) *J* iubentius V^1 (*corr.* V^2): luberitius *J* 120. *Post* seruimus *Hegionis pers. dedit Pylades, lorarii libri* (LOR. *DVE*, LOLARIVS *B*, LOLAR. *J*) nouidere *DB* (Noui de re): non uidere *VEJ*

in the prayer mentioned by Cato *R. R.* 139 *Si deus, si dea es...precor uti sies uolens propitius*), and the like. On the jussive use of *uti*, *ut* see note on v. 794. "More probably it means 'provided that,' cf. Cic. *Verr.* II. iii. 47. 112 *ager efficit cum octavo, bene ut agatur, verum, ut omnes di adiuvent, cum decimo.*" Hallidie.

116. **Liber captiuos**, 'a captive who is allowed some liberty,' not 'a free man who has been taken prisoner,' as Hallidie says. **Auis.** The Genitive with *similis*, *dissimilis*, &c. is normal, probably invariable, in Plautus and Terence (see note on v. 582).

118. **Numquam postilla.** *Curc.* 529 *numquám postílla uidi.* This is the normal order of *numquam* with an Adverb. The spondee-word *numquam* in the second foot is so closely connected with *postilla* as not to mar the rhythm (Introd. iii. § 7). **Postilla.** This Adverb, like *postillac*, *postidea*, *postibi*, is peculiar to the older language. It occurs several times in Plautus and Terence, and once even in Catullus (84. 9 *Nec sibi postilla metuebant talia uerba*).

120. **Videre.** As the 2 Sg. Pass. ending Terence uses only *-re*, Plautus both *-re* and *-ris*, but *-re* far more frequently. In *Curc.* 40 *obloquere*, 'you are impertinent,' is perversely understood as an Imperative by the slave to whom the remark is addressed:

A. Obloquere. *B.* Fiat maxume. *A.* Etiam taces?
B. Nempe obloqui me iusseras.

Ita, here used with *uideor*, as elsewhere *ita* and other Adverbs with *sum*, e.g. Ter. *Phorm.* 529 *ego hunc esse aliter credidi.* This use of the Adverb instead of the Adjective is a feature of colloquial Latin (see note on v. 271). **Tu quidem.** The different pronunciations of these phrases with *quidem* (see Introd. ii. § 13) are best indicated by writing *tū quidem* &c. as two words, *tŭquidem* &c. as one.

LOR. Si non est quod dem, mene uis dem ipse—in pedes?
HEG. Si dederis, erit extemplo mihi quod dem tibi.
LOR. Auis me ferae consimilem faciam, ut praedicas.
HEG. Ita ut dicis: nam si faxis, te in caueam dabo.
Sed satis uerborum est. Cura quae iussi atque abi.
Ego ibo ad fratrem ad alios captiuos meos,

---

121. *Lorarii pers. add. Pylades, cui continuant libri* menetuis *D*: meneius *E* men uis dem ipsus *Schraderus de partic. -ne p.* 9 123. *versum laudat Servius Danielis ad Verg. Aen.* x 559 'aui—praedicas' aui *Servius* ferae *Servius*: fere *libri* similem *Servius* fatiam *E* praedicas *Servius*: predicisti *libri* (-dix- V^2J) 125. que *DE* *Post hunc versum sequuntur in libris vv.* 102—107, *quibus* Lol. *praescr.* B^3, *nihil DVEJ*: *traiecit Acidalius*

---

121. 'If my hands are empty (*quod dem*, sc. money for manumission; cf. *Trin.* 564), shall I take to my heels?' (Cf. *Comedy of Errors* I. ii. 'Hold your hands! Nay, an you will not, sir, I'll take to my heels.') There is some reason for accepting Schrader's emendation *men uis dem ipsus*; for in the first place the interrogative particle commonly appears as *-n* after a long vowel (e.g. *quin* for *qui-ne*), and in the second *ipsus* is the normal form in conjunction with *se*, *suus*, and the like. The change of *ipsus* into *ipse*, and the substitution of the full for the curtailed form of the particle, are too common in MSS. to cause us any great scruples in altering their reading in this line. Still we have elsewhere the full form of the Interrogative Particle in our MSS. after an emphatic monosyllable, e.g. Ter. *Phorm.* 448 *mene uis?*, where *men* is impossible.

122. **Quod dem**, sc. punishment.

123. **Me** emphatic. Scan *auīs mé ferae.*

124. **Ita ut dicis.** Ter. *Phorm.* 396 *Ita ŭt dícis.* **Faxis** (see note on v. 695). **Caueam.** The *pistrinum* is alluded to.

125. **Satis uerborum est.** Usually *uerbúm* (Gen. Pl.) *sat est* (*Bacch.* 878, *Rud.* 866, *Truc.* 644), but Ter. *Phorm.* 436 *Satis ídm uerbórumst.* **Cura quae iussi atque abi.** The 'lorarius' now leaves the stage to get his assistants to come and help him to carry out Hegio's orders (vv. 111—2).

126. Hegio's dealings in Elean prisoners of war (vv. 98—100) have been so extensive that his own 'ergastulum' is not large enough, and he has had to avail himself of his brother's too. He does not carry out his intention (vv. 192 sqq.) of going to his brother's house till after Act II. Sc. iii. (v. 458 *Ad fratrem modo captiuos alios inuiso meos*). The house

Visam ne nocte hac quippiam turbauerint.
Inde me continuo recipiam rursum domum.
ERG. Aegre est mi hunc facere quaestum carcerarium
Propter sui gnati miseriam miserum senem.

---

127. quipiam *BDV* 128. surssum *J* 129. Egre est mihi *libri* (Aeg- *J*, michi *J*) questum *libri* 130. miseriam miserum *ex* miseram miseram *J*

---

was probably not seen on the stage, for, if it had been, we should have expected some indication by the use of a Demonstrative Pronoun or Adverb. **Ad fratrem ad...captiuos** (see note on v. 175).

127. **(Ibo)...Visam.** This Asyndeton is normal with *eo* and *uiso*, e.g. *Pers.* 77 *Nunc huc intro ibo, uisam hesternas reliquias, Quierintne recte necne* (cf. *Bacch.* 235). But *ibo ut uisam* occurs in *Aul.* 65 *Nunc ibo ut uisam sitne ita aurum ut condidi* (cf. *Bacch.* 529). **Nocte hac,** with a Perfect Tense means 'last night' (e.g. *Amph.* 731 *qui hac noctu in portum aduecti sumus*), but otherwise 'to-night' (e.g. *Trin.* 869 *hac noctu agitandumst uigilias*). **Quippiam.** The archetype of our MSS. had *quipiam*, which might be Abl. or rather Instrumental (note on v. 88) of *quispiam*, as *aliqui* (*Truc.* 922 *gaudere aliqui me uolo*) of *aliquis*. Since however the ordinary construction of *turbo* is with Acc. Neut. (e.g. *Most.* 1031 *numquid Tranio turbauit?*), and since the existence of the form *quipiam* lacks certainty, it is perhaps safer to regard *quipiam* as a mere misspelling. Indeed the analogy of *Jŭppiter* (with short *u* and double *pp*), the accepted spelling of *Jū-piter* (with long *u* and single *p*), suggests that by a Latin phonetical law *quī-piam*, if such a form ever existed, would have become *quĭppiam*. *Quippe*, the Conjunction, may have been originally *quī-pe*.

128. **Inde me,** pronounced *ind' me* (Introd. ii. § 8).

129. As Hegio turns to go away, Ergasilus, to attract his attention, utters aloud some sympathetic remarks, of which v. 132 is probably 'aside' to the audience. His gradual attraction of Hegio's compassion towards his own dinnerless condition is very cleverly managed. **Aegre est mi,** with Acc. and Inf. (cf. v. 701). The opposite was *uolup est mi.* Cf. *Mil.* 747 *si illis aegrest mihi id quod uolup est.*

130. **Propter sui gnati miseriam** probably goes with *facere quaestum carcerarium* (cf. v. 98 *Nunc hic occepit quaestum hunc fili gratia*), rather than with *miserum* (cf. *Rud.* 127 *Propter eiusmodi uiros uiuo miser*). Jingling phrases with *miser, miseria, misere*, &c. are common in Plautus, e.g. *Epid.* 526 *Siquid est homini miseriarum quod miserescat, miser ex animost*, Truc. 466 *ea illi miserae miseriast* (cf. *Amph.* 590, *Aul.* 721, *Cist.* 689, *Epid.* 667, *Men.* 817, *Pers.* 646, *Rud.* 216, *Trin.* 430).

Sed si ullo pacto ille huc conciliari potest,
Vel carnuficinam hunc facere possum perpeti.
HEG. Quis hic loquitur? ERG. Ego, qui tuo maerore macеror,
Macesco, consenesco et tabesco miser;
Ossa atque pellis sum misera—macritudine;

---

131. ullo *ex* ullu *D* pacto ille pacto ille *J* 132. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 119 'carnificinam hic facere possum perpetim' carmificinam *J*: carnificinam *ceteri* 133. merore *libri* 134. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 348 'macesco—miser' 135. *versum laudat Nonius p.* 136, 1 'ossa—macritudine' pelli sum *Nonius* miser a macritudine B^1 (*ex* misera macr. *ut vid.*) DV^1E: misera macritudine B^2V^2J: miser macritudine *Nonius*

---

131. **Conciliari** (see note on v. 33).

132. **Vel** (cf. v. 90). **Carnuficinam.** Its horrors are described in a passage of the *Cistellaria*, where young Alcesimarchus tells his experience in Cupid's 'carnificina' (vv. 206 sqq.):

Iactor, agitor, stimulor, uersor
In amoris rota, miser exanimor,
Feror, differor, distrahor, diripior.

Hunc (see note on v. 2).

133. **Hic** is the Adverb *hĭc*, here shortened by the Law of Breves Breviantes in the phrase, pronounced *Quis hic lŏquitur?* (Introd. ii. § 22). The phrase is a common one. We have also *quis homo hic loquitur?* Aul. 731. **Ego**, being emphatic, has the verse-ictus. **Tuo maerore**, probably means 'grief for you,' like *meo terrore*, 'fear of me,' in *Amph.* 1066 *qui terrore meo occidistis prae metu.*

134. **Consenesco.** Cf. *Stich.* 215 *Prae maerore adeo miser atque aegritudine Consenui.* Rhyme is a common device of Early Latin Poetry, sometimes to lend dignity to a passage (e.g. Enn. *Trag.* 86 R. *Haec omnia uidi inflammari, Priamo ui uitam euitari, Iouis aram sanguine turpari*), sometimes, as here (cf. v. 87), to give a ludicrous effect. **Et** is often used by Plautus before the last of a series of coordinate words, e.g. *Pseud.* 44 *animo, corde et pectore.*

135. **Ossa atque pellis**, 'skin and bones.' *Aul.* 564 (of a lamb) *Quia ossa ac pellis totust, ita cura macet.* **Misera.** Some form of *miser* is required for this line by Nonius' confirmation of the reading of our MSS. (see the apparatus criticus), so that emendations like *mera*, *mira* (cf. *Rud.* 485 *miserum* ABD, *mirum* C) are out of the question. To read *miser a macritudine* with some MSS. (cf. *Cas.* 520 *m. ex amore*) or *miser macritudine* with the traditional text of Nonius (cf. *Truc.* 520 *morbo m.*) involves

Neque umquam quicquam me iuuat quod edo domi:
Foris aliquantillum etiam quod gusto, id beat.
HEG. Ergasile, salue. ERG. Di te bene ament, Hegio.
HEG. Ne fle. ERG. Egone illum non fleam? egon non defleam
Talem adulescentem? HEG. Semper sensi filio

---

136. unquam *E* uiuat *J* quod aedo *BV*: quo aedo *D* 137. aliquantillulum *Spengelius Philol. t.* xxxvii. *p.* 422 138. Ergo sile *BDVE* (*corr. rec.*): Ergasile *ex* Erga sile *J* dii *J* egio *libri* (*ex* eio *E*) 139. egone (Egonne *B*) illum non fleam *BD*: egone illum fleam *VEJ* egone non *BDV*²: ego me non *V*¹*EJ* 140. Tale *V*¹*E* adulescentem *BD* (c *ex* t) *V*: adolescente *E*: adolescentem *J*

---

a somewhat pointless repetition of *miser* from the preceding line. The best testimony of our MSS. (*B*³) supports *misera macritudine*, a phrase which may be accepted if we suppose that Ergasilus was going to say *misera aerumna* (*Curc.* 142 *misera adfligitur aerumna*) or something of the kind, but, hesitating to utter the untruth, substituted *macritudine* with comical effect (cf. v. 152). It may be, as v. 137 probably is, an 'aside.'

136. **Neque umquam quicquam** (see note on v. 76).

137. This line is probably spoken 'aside.' **Foris.** On the scansion see note on v. 60. **Aliquantillum,** only here in Plautus (see note on *quantillum* v. 193). Notice the climax, *aliquantillum*, 'a tiny scrap'; *etiam quod gusto*, 'and even a mere taste of that.' *Gusto* is contrasted with *edo* of v. 136, as *beat*, a common expression in the Comedians, with *iuuat* of the same line. For the position of the contrasted words, *domi* at the end of one line, and *foris* at the beginning of the next, cf. *Most.* 709.

138. **Di te bene ament.** The normal metrical ictus, and no doubt the accentuation in everyday utterance of this phrase is *dí te béne ament.* Without *bene* it appears normally as *dí te ament.* The Pronoun was thus enclitic in this word-group, as with us in 'God bless you.' Ergasilus speaks these words through sobs.

139. **Ne fle,** a common construction (cf. v. 554 *ne uerere*). **Egone** &c. *Truc.* 441 *Egone illam ut non amem? egone illi ut non bene uelim?...Ego isti non munus mittam?.* An example of the formula (as here) without *ut* is *Curc.* 10 *Egone apicularum congestum opera non feram, Ex dulci oriundum melculo dulci meo?.* **Defleam** (again, *Stich.* 212 *Quot adeo cenae, quas defleui, mortuae*), with intensive *de*, as *depereo*, e.g. *Epid.* 64 A. *Amatne istam quam emit de praeda?* B. *Rogas? Deperit.*

Meo te esse amicum, et illum intellexi tibi.
ERG. Tum denique homines nostra intellegimus bona,
Qum quae in potestate habuimus, ea amisimus.
Ego, postquam gnatus tuus potitust hostium,
Expertus quanti fuerit nunc desidero.
HEG. Alienus cum eius incommodum tam aegre feras,
Quid me patrem par facerest, cui ille est unicus?
ERG. Alienus? ego alienus illi? aha, Hegio,

---

141. illum (ll *ex* n) *D* 142. *Parasiti personam quam v.* 144 *habent libri, huic versui praescripsit Pylades* intelligimus *V* : intellimus *ex* intellemus E^1: intelligimus E^2 143. Qumque *DE* : Cumque (-quae B^3) *B* : Quinque V^1: Cum quae V^2: *J n. l.* 144. *Cf. ad v.* 142 potitus est *libri* ostium *BD* (*ex* hostium) 145. fuerit *ex* -rint *B* *ante* nunc 2 *l. sp. V* desidero *ex* -rio *E* 146. egre *libri* (aeg- *J*) 147. facerest DV^1E : facere est BV^2J cui (c *ex corr.*) *V* ille (ll *ex* n *ut vid.*) *D* 148. PAR. *in v. principio om., ante interjectionem add. DVEJ, ubi* 4—5 *litt. spat. habet B* Alienus ego? *vulgo dist.* ille *libri* : *corr. Bothius* hah egio B^1VE : ha hegio B^3D : ah egio *J* : *corr. Richterus in Studemundi Studiis in prisc. script. lat. t.* I *p.* 395

142—143. *Trag.* frag. inc. civ. R. *Quam cara sint quae post carendo intellegunt.* We have a fuller expression of the same idea in *Much Ado about Nothing* IV. i.:

For it so falls out,
That what we have we prize not to the worth,
Whiles we enjoy it; but being lack'd and lost,
Why, then we rack the value; then we find
The virtue, that possession would not show us
Whiles it was ours.

143. **Qum.** The spelling *qum*, *pequnia* &c. is often found on inscriptions, especially of the time of the Gracchi. Our MSS. of Plautus exhibit the three spellings *qum* (often corrupted to *quin*, e.g. v. 78), *quom* and *cum*.

144. Cf. note on v. 92 *Nam postquam meus rex est potitus hostium.*

146. **Cum...feras.** For the Subjunctive with Causal Adversative *cum* cf. *Bacch.* 907 *ut eum dictis plurimis Castigem, quom haec sic facta ad hunc faciat modum*, Mil. 1342 *nequeo quin fleam, Quom abs te abeam*, Trin. 731 *quom eius rem penes me habeam domi*; cf. *Men.* 361:

Animule mi, mihi mira uidentur
Te hic stare foris, fores quoi pateant,
Magis quam domus tua domus quom haec tua sit.

148. **Alienus? ego alienus illi?** Schoell's punctuation seems to me

Numquam istuc dixis neque animum induxis tuum:

149. Nunquam *D* induxis *ex* eduxis *D*: induxisti *VE*: induxti *J*

to give better rhythm than the punctuation in the MSS. *alienus ego? alienus ille?*, a punctuation which was presumably given to the line by some Carolingian monk, and which therefore has no strong traditional claims to respect. Although *ille*, the reading of the MSS., might be tolerated, the sense of the line is greatly improved by the slight change to *illi*. **Aha**, the Interjection of deprecation, refusal, e.g. *Trin.* 1060 *aha nimium, Stasime, saeuiter*, is the suitable word in this context. The MSS., which often play havoc with unfamiliar Interjection forms, have *ha*.

149. **Numquam...dixis neque...induxis.** *Dixis* (*dixim*) and *induxis* (*induxim*) are S-Aor. Optative-forms, as *dixis* (*dixo*), *induxis* (*induxo*) are S-Aor. Subjunctive-forms (see note on *faxis*, v. 695). Like the Perf. Subj. in so-called 'prohibitive' sentences in Cicero with *nec* (not *neu*), e.g. *nec mihi illud dixeris* (*Fin.* i. 7. 25), they have really Potential force, 'never should you say, nor imagine.' Cf. *Trin.* 627 *sta ilico. Noli auorsari, neque te occultassis mihi*; Sall. *Jug.* 110, 4 *arma, viros, pecuniam, postremo quicquid animo lubet, sume, utere, et quoad vives, numquam tibi redditam gratiam putaveris.* **Istuc...animum induxis.** We find in Plautus and Terence two forms of expression: (1) perhaps the older, with *animum*, or *in animum*, governed by *in* of *induco*, and with some other word, as here *istuc*, the direct object of *induco*; (2) with *animum*, the direct object of *induco*. Of the first, examples are:

Mil. 1269 *Induxi in animum, ne oderim item ut alias, quando orasti.*

Rud. prol. 22:

Atque hoc scelesti in animum inducunt suom,
Iouem se placare posse donis, hostiis.

Ter. *Hec.* 292 *Leuia sunt, quae tu pergrauia esse in animum induxti tuom.*

Of the second, *Pers.* 66:

animus induci potest,
Eum esse ciuem et fidelem et bonum.

Ter. *Adel.* 68 *sic animum induco meum.*

Most examples stand on the border-line between these two constructions, e.g.

Trin. 704 *Id me commissurum ut patiar fieri, ne animum induxeris.*
Stich. 346 *Animum inducam, ut istuc uerum te elocutum esse arbitrer*
Ter. *Haut.* prol. 41 *causam hanc iustam esse animum inducite.*

(Cf. note on *hoc animum aduorte* v. 329.)

[redacted]

Tibi ille unicust, mi etiam unico magis unicus.
Heg. Laudo, malum cum amici tuum ducis malum.
Nunc habe bonum animum. Erg. Eheu, huic illud dolet,—

---

150. unicus est *libri* mihi *BDV*: michi *EJ* 151. dicis *VEJ* 152. amicum J^1 heu V^1 Huic—dolet *cum v.* 153 *Hegioni dant libri*: *corr. Bothius*

---

150. Cf. *Cas.* 262:

A. Quia enim filio
Nos oportet opitulari unico. *B.* At quamquam unicust,
Nilo magis ille unicust mihi (*unicus est ille mihi* MSS.) filius quam ego illi pater.

Also *Bacch.* 407. **Mi.** In the MSS. *mihi* seems to be written when the scribe realized that the Dat. Sg. of the Pronoun was meant, *mi* being reserved for the Voc. Sg. of the Possessive, e.g. *mi pater.* We need not therefore have scruples in changing *mihi* of the MSS. to *mi* or 'vice versa.' In this line there is something to be said for the retention of the form *mihi*, and the avoidance of the absorption by elision of a word, whose contrast to *tibi* would bring it a certain amount of stress. This would however involve an abnormal division of a proceleusmatic between words *u|nicŭst mĭhi e|tiam* (see Introd. iii. § 9), unless we are to admit the by-form *uncus* (see note on v. 321), like *ardus*, a by-form of *aridus.* **Unico magis unicus.** *Cist.* 644 *O Salute mea salus salubrior*, Curc. 551 *stultior stulto fuisti.*

151. **Cum...ducis**, a very frequent construction after verbs of praising and thanking (cf. vv. 356, 373, 922). So in Cic. *Fam.* xiii. 24. 2 *tibi maximas gratias ago, cum tantum litterae meae potuerunt*, although *quod* is the real equivalent in Cicero to Plautine *quom* in this use. **Malum cum.** In pronunciation the accent would probably fall on the second syllable of *malum* (see note on v. 18). **Amici** and **tuum**, the emphatic words, have the metrical ictus. **Ducis**, without *esse*, as in *Merc.* 322 *at ne deteriorem tamen Hoc facto ducas*, &c.

152 sqq. I follow the usual distribution of the lines in recent editions. Lambinus, who corrected most of the mistakes in the 'notae personarum' of the MSS. in this passage, may have used the famous 'codex Turnebi' (Introd. i. § 2).

152. **Habe bonum animum.** This is the usual form of the phrase (a phrase not found in Terence, who uses only *bono animo es*), *hábĕ bonum ánimum*, while *hábe animŭm bonum* (sometimes *bonum ánimum habe*) is admitted through metrical exigencies at the end of a line &c. In v. 167, as in *Pseud.* 866, we have *habĕ mŏdo bonum ánimum*; in *Mil.* 1011 and

Quia nunc remissus est edendi exercitus.
HEG. Nullumne interea nactu's, qui posset tibi
Remissum quem dixti imperare exercitum?

---

154. ERG. *libri*: HEG. *Lambinus, qui etiam in sequentibus personas distribuit 'aliquot librorum antiquorum auctoritatem secutus'* (*fort. T significatur*) Nillumne V^1 155. dixit *libri* (*corr.* V^2J)

Bacch. 630 *bonum habe ánimum.* The phrase *bono animo es* (at the end of a line &c. through metrical exigencies *animó bono es*) seems to have been pronounced as a single word, with the accent normally on the first (*bón*(*o*)-*animo's*), but occasionally on the second syllable (*bon*(*o*)-*ánimo's*), (*Amph.* 1131, *Mil.* 1342, Ter. *Haut.* 821). The encouraging fact, the prospect of recovering Philopolemus, is mentioned below (v. 167). **Huic** is usually explained as *uentri*, Ergasilus being supposed to lay his hand on his stomach at this word, as the thief holds up his hand in *Epid.* 10:

A. Corpulentior uidere atque habitior. *B.* Huic gratia.

(Cf. *Trin.* 541 *tam glabrae, em quam haec est manus*), or as Sannio lifts his finger in Ter. *Adel.* 162:

Tu quod te posterius purges, hanc iniuriam mihi nolle
Factam esse, huius non faciam.

(Cf. Donat. ad loc.: '*huius' autem δεικτικόν est; aut enim stipulam aut floccum noverat aut summum digitum*), or as the old man points to his white hair in *Bacch.* 1102 *Perii, hoc seruom meum non nauci facere esse ausum!* But *huic* may have its common sense of *mihi*; and it is perhaps more in keeping with the situation, if we take *huic illud dolet* to mean 'it is a real grief to me,' and suppose that Ergasilus, instead of going on to add 'that your son has been captured,' by a sudden impulse tells the honest truth and substitutes 'that the eating levies have now been disbanded' (cf. note on v. 135). On the hiatus at the change of speaker and after *eheu* see Introd. ii. § 42. **Dolet**, Impers. See note on v. 928.

153. **Quia**, freq. after verbs of the emotions, e.g. v. 203, *Epid.* 107 *Idne pudet te quia captiuam genere prognatam bono In praeda es mercatus?* **Remissus est exercitus.** We have another metaphor from the same source in *Cist.* 58 *Noli, obsecro, lacrumis tuis mi exercitum imperare,* 'do not by your tears call out my contingent,' sc. of weeping. The common military term *remitto* recurs in *Epid.* 206 *a legione omnes remissi sunt domum.* **Edendi exercitus**, a curious use of the Genitive of the Gerund. The nearest parallel is in the (un-Plautine?) prologue of the *Poenulus* (v. 34): *Domum sermones fabulandi conferant.*

154. **Posset.** On the Mood see note on v. 1033.

[redacted]

ERG. Quid credis? fugitant omnes hanc prouinciam,
Quoi optigerat postquam captust Philopolemus tuus.
HEG. Non pol mirandum est fugitare hanc prouinciam.
Multis et multigeneribus opus est tibi
Militibus: primumdum opus est Pistorensibus;
Eorum sunt aliquot genera Pistorensium:

---

156. ERG. *add. Lambinus* (*cf. ad v.* 154) 156—7. Quid credis? postquam...tuus, Quoi optigerat, fugitant...prouinciam *Brixius* (*Em. in Pl. Capt. p.* 8) 157. Quod *libri* (*J n. l.*) obtigerat *BD*: optigerat *VEJ ut vid.* captus est *libri* 159. *Parasito dant libri* (*J n. l.*): *corr. Lambinus* (*cf. ad v.* 154) multi generibus *BE ex ras.* V^2J: multis generibus DV^1 160. pistorem sibus *D* 161. *versum secl. Schoellius* aliquod *VE* pistorensium *ex* pistorumensium *E*

---

156. **Fugitant** (see note on v. 83), 'keep out of the way of,' 'avoid.' Cf. v. 541 *meos...fugitare oculos*, Poen. 508 *Atque equidem hercle dedita opera amicos fugitaui senes.*

157. Brix' proposed change of the order of the MSS. to *Quid credis? postquam* &c., *Quoi optigerat, fugitant,* &c. is unnecessary, though we have similar transpositions in the MSS. at *Mil.* 593, *Pers.* 691. It is also wrong to translate *quoi* as 'cuicumque' and understand the sentence as *omnes quoi optigerat fugitant* &c. *Quoi* must refer to Philopolemus. **Optigerat,** current in this sense, e.g. Cic. *Vat.* 5. 12 *cum tibi magno clamore aquaria provincia sorte optigisset.*

159. **Multigeneribus.** In *Stich.* 383 we have another form of expression: *Poste unguenta multigenerum multa* (cf. *omnimodis, multimodis* for *omnibus modis, multis modis*). Lucr. ii. 335 uses Abl. Plur. *multigenis* (cf. Virgil's *omnigenum* Gen. Pl.):

Percipe, multigenis quam sint variata figuris.

160. **Primumdum,** a formation of the type of *etiamdum, interdum,* &c., not unfrequent in Plautus, e.g. *Most.* 400 *Omnium primumdum haec aedes iam face occlusae sient,* Truc. 31 *Primumdum merces annua: is primus bolust,* Trin. 98 *primumdum omnium,* 'first of all.' **Pistorensibus,** a pun on (1) *pistor,* 'miller,' later 'baker,' (2) the town of Pistoria in Etruria. On the change of meaning of the word *pistor* cf. Pliny *N. H.* XVIII. xi. 28 *Pistores* (i.e. bakers) *Romae non fuere ad Persicum usque bellum annis ab urbe condita super DLXXX. Ipsi panem faciebant Quirites ...certumque fit Atei Capitonis sententia cocos tum panem lautioribus coquere solitos pistoresque tantum eos qui far pisebant nominatos.* This statement of Pliny argues for the post-Plautine authorship of v. 161.

Opus Paniceis est, opus Placentinis quoque,
Opus Turdetanis, opust Ficedulensibus;
Iam maritumi omnes milites opus sunt tibi.

---

162. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 433 'opus paniceis est opus et placentinis' *idem p.* 442 'opus est paniceis opus et placentinis' placentinus V^1 (*corr.* V^2 *ut vid.*): placentinis *ex* planicentinis *E* 163. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 232 'opus est turdetanis opus fiscedulensibus' (*cf. Osb. p.* 244) tardetanis *J* opust *E*: opus est *BDVJ* 164. *versum laudat Nonius p.* 482, 2 (*s.v.* opus est *cum accus.*) 'iam—tibi' omnes *ex* omni- *V* milites (i *alt. ex* t) *J* *post* sunt *spat. D*

---

162. **Paniceis.** What town, if any, supplied this pun is unknown. Schoell suggests that the word may be *Panicis* with *ei* the old spelling of classical *ī* (see note on the Argument), and punctuates *Opus Panicis, est opus* &c. **Placentinis** puns on (1) *placenta*, 'a cake,' (2) Placentia, the town in N. Italy.

163. **Turdetanis.** This Spanish tribe in S. Spain had perhaps been brought into notice through the military operations during the Second Punic War. The name is of course selected for the sake of a pun on *turdus*. **Ficedulensibus.** No satisfactory guess has been made about the locality of this tribe or parish, whose name suggests the *ficedula*, 'beccafico.' Spengel (*Philologus* xxxvii. 425) proposes *Fideculensibus*, since a town *Fideculae* is mentioned in Valer. Max. vii. 6, and suggests that *fĭdĭculae*, 'lyre-strings,' may have been the name of some kind of pastry.

164. **Milites opus sunt.** Aulus Gellius (xvii. 2. 15) calls attention to this construction of *opus est* in Early Latin: '*Nihil sibi' inquit* (Q. Claudius Quadrigarius) '*divitias opus esse.' Nos 'divitiis' dicimus. Set vitium hoc orationis nullum est, ac ne id quidem est, quod figura dici solet: recta enim istaec oratio est et veteres conpluscule ita dixerunt.* "The predicate use of *opus* is probably the original one (cf. *Most.* 412 *id uiri doctist opus*). The instrumental Abl. (160, 225, *Most.* 251) is more common and was perhaps formed on the analogy of the Abl. with the Verbal Noun *usus* (*Amph.* 505, *Bacch.* 706 sq., *Trin.* 503 sq.). Plautus has also after *opus* the Inf. (*Pers.* 584), the Acc. and Inf. (*Bacch.* 989), the Subj. with *ut* (*Truc.* 500) and without (*Merc.* 1004), and possibly the Acc. (cf. *Truc.* 902 sqq. with *Pseud.* 385)." (Morris, *ad loc.*) With the repetition of *opus est* in these lines cf. *Truc.* 902 sqq.:

Puero opust cibo (*cibum* MSS.), opus est matri autem, quae puerum lauit,
Opust nutrici, lact ut habeat, ueteris uini largiter
Ut dies noctesque potet, opust ligno, opust carbonibus,
Fasciis opus est, puluinis, cunis, incunabulis,
Oleum opus est, <opus est> farina, puerus (v.l. *porro opus*) est totum diem:
Numquam hoc uno die efficiatur opus, quin opus semper siet.

[redacted]

ERG. Vt saepe summa ingenia in occulto latent;
Hic qualis imperator nunc priuatus est.
HEG. Habe modo bonum animum, nam illum confido domum
In his diebus me reconciliassere.
Nam eccum hic captiuom adulescentem Aleum,

---

165. ERG. *add. Lambinus* (*cf. ad v.* 154) sepe *libri* 167. *Hegionis pers. om. E* (*J n. l.*) modo *om. J ut vid.* nalllum (*ut vid.*) *D* 168. his *s. v. D* reconciliasere *ex* -liassere *B*: reconciliare V^2: reconciasse *adscr.* vel re *J* 169. captiuum *VE* adhulescentem *B*: adolescentem *J* alium *libri* <intus> Aleum *Schoellius*

---

165. "The world knows nothing of its greatest men," *Philip van Artevelde.*

167. **Habe modo bonum animum** (see note on v. 152).

168. **In his diebus.** Cf. *Pseud.* 316 *ego in hoc triduo Aut terra aut mari aliquonde euoluam id argentum tibi.* The phrase more often lacks *in*, e.g. *Most.* 238 *Nam neque edes quicquam neque bibes apud me his decem diebus*, Pers. 504 *Neque istoc redire his octo possum mensibus*; cf. *Poen.* 872, Ter. *Adel.* 520. **Reconciliassere.** See note on v. 33. These forms with *-ss-* belong mostly to the First Conjugation, though we find in the Second *prohibessit*, *cohibessit* (Lucr. iii. 444), *licessit* (Plaut. *Asin.* 603), &c., while for the Fourth *ambissit* (MSS. *ambisset*) in the (un-Plautine?) prologue of the *Amphitruo* (v. 71) is quoted. By Terence's time they are going out of use. *Appellassis* (*Phorm.* 742) is one of the few instances found in his plays. By origin these are S-Aorist forms, like *faxo* &c. (see note on v. 695), and correspond exactly to the Greek S-Aorists of Vowel Conjugations. Thus *reconciliasso*, Subjunctive with Future force, corresponds to Greek τιμήσω Subj., originally τιμάσσω, as *dixo* (*deixo*) corresponds to Greek δείξω Subj. The parts which are found in Latin are (1) 'Fut.' Subj. *reconciliasso*, *-is* &c., (2) Opt. *reconciliassim*, *-is* &c., (3) Inf. *reconciliassere* (cf. *confido me impetrassere* Aul. 687, *Mil.* 1128, *expugnassere Amph.* 210), (4) in legal diction also a Passive, e.g. *mercassitur* (*C. I. L.* i. 200. 71), *turbassitur* in a law in Cicero (*de Legg.* iii. 4. 11).

169. With Hiatus after *nam* and Hiatus after *eccum*, both of them probably legitimate cases of Hiatus (Introd. ii. §§ 41, 44), the line will need no alteration. The supposed defect in the line is usually supplied by editors with *<intus> Aleum* (cf. *Bacch.* 568 *duas ergo hic intus eccas Bacchides*). But I see no reason for not believing the Captives to be on the stage throughout this Scene (see note on v. 252). If a word is missing, it may be *alium*, which would easily be omitted by a scribe before *Aleum* (miswritten *alium*):

Prognatum genere summo et summis diuitiis:

170. diuioiis *BD*: diuitiis *VEJ*

Nam écum hic captiuom adulescentem <alium> Aleum, *alium* referring to his new purchase of yesterday (v. 111). Another possibility is that *adulescentem* should be *adulescentulum*, for Diminutive forms are often replaced by Simple forms in our MSS. (Thus in Ter. *Haut.* 546 the Codex Bembinus substitutes *adulescentis* for *adulescentuli*.) **Eccum** (*eccam*, *eccos*, *eccas*, *ecca* Acc. Pl. Neut.) is apparently composed of *ecce* and *hum*, an obsolete by-form of *hunc* which lacked the particle *-ce*. With *ecce* prefixed this particle was regarded as superfluous, just as *eccillum*, *eccistum* are the invariable forms, never *eccillunc*, *eccistunc*. This interjectional compound passed more and more into use as a Demonstrative in Vulgar Latin, supplanting *ille* which became a mere Definite Article. It is from this late Latin Pronoun that the Romance Demonstratives, Fr. *celui*, *celle*, Ital. *quello*, &c., have sprung. The Italian Interjection *ecco* is a direct descendant of *eccum*, which is often used absolutely, e.g. *Mil.* 25 A. *Ubi tu es?* B. *Eccum*, or followed by an Accusative, e.g. *Mil.* 1216 *era, eccum praesto militem.* Sometimes *video* or a similar verb accompanies *eccum*, e.g. *Men.* 705 *sed eccum uideo.* In the Dramatists *ecce* in conjunction with a Pronoun (*ecce me*, *eccum*, &c.) takes the place of *ecce* when a person or thing that is in sight or in the neighbourhood is referred to, the simple form *ecce* being used only in calling attention to actions, e.g. *Mil.* 456 *ecce, omitto*, and with Abstract Nouns, &c., e.g. *Rud.* 1178 *ecce Gripi scelera.* The subject of the sentence is usually attracted into the Acc. by *eccum*, &c., e.g. *Amph.* 1005 *sed eccum Amphitruonem aduĕnit*, except when the verb precedes, e.g. *Pseud.* 693 *uĕnit eccum Calidorus.*

170. Cf. vv. 318—9. **Prognatum genere summo.** *Epid.* 107 *Idne pudet te quia captiuam genere prognatam bono In praeda es mercatus?*, *Aul.* 212 A. *Dic mihi, quali me arbitrare genere prognatum?* B. *Bono*, *Poen.* 1201 *Non eo genere sumus prognatae, tam etsi sumus seruae, soror, Ut deceat nos facere quicquam quod homo quisquam inrideat.* The alliterative *prognatus patre* is a phrase much affected by Plautus, e.g. *Amph.* 365, 614 *Dauo prognatum patre*, Men. 408, 1078 *Moscho prognatum patre.* It occurs on one of the Scipio epitaphs (*C.I.L.* i. 30) *Gnaiuod patre prognatus, fortis uir sapiensque* (see note on v. 295). **Summis diuitiis** is more likely to have the sense of 'a very wealthy house' (cf. *Trin.* 605 *sine dote ille illam in tantas diuitias dabit?*, Poen. 904 *Is in diuitias homo adoptauit hunc*), and to be governed by *prognatum*, than to be Abl. of Description (e.g. v. 279 A. *quo honore est illic?* B. *Summo*). **Diuitiis** is here and occasionally elsewhere (*Rud.* 542, *Poen.* prol. 60, *Trin.* 682) pronounced *ditiis.* This trisyllabic pronunciation is the only one used by Terence. But, however pronounced, the word is always spelt in full in our MSS.

[redacted]

Hoc illum me mutare †confido fore.
ERG. Ita di deaeque faxint! Sed num quo foras
Vocatus <es> ad cenam? HEG. Nusquam, quod sciam.

---

171. *fort.* ERG. Co. fo.: c. pote *Muellerus in Fleck. Annal.* xciii *p.* 508 fore *ex* fere *J* 172. dii *J* deque *libri* (dae quae *J*) HEG. sed *libri*: *corr. Spengelius Philol.* xxxvii *p.* 426 numquo *ex* numquam *D*: unumquo V^1 (*corr.* V^2): nunquo J^1: nunquam J^2 173. *suppl.* ς caenam *V* ERG. *libri*: *corr. Spengelius*

---

171. **Fore.** The reading of the MSS. is generally thought to be merely a miswriting (produced by *foras* at the end of the following line) for *pote*; and this explanation is certainly simpler than the supposition of a lacuna or a correction like *Hoc illum me mutare, id confido fore.* At the same time it must be remarked that *confido* (*-am*) *fore* is an extremely common phrase (usually at the end of a line; e.g. v. 575, *Amph.* 935, *Cist.* 73, *Pers.* 286, 627, *Trin.* 460, Ter. *Adel.* 826; cf. *Capt.* 696), and that the construction *confido pote mutare* would be unique. For *confido* (used absolutely in *Pseud.* 1204?) takes in Plautus either a Dative (e.g. v. 536) or a Fut. Inf. (with or without an Acc.) of the form (1) *fore*, &c., (2) in *-assere* (e.g. v. 167), (3) Fut. Part. without *esse*, e.g. *confuturum* Mil. 941 (*adfuturum esse* Ter. *Haut.* 160). Perhaps Ergasilus interrupts Hegio with *confido* etc.

172. **Faxint.** These S-Aor. Optative forms (see note on v. 149) are specially appropriate to prayers. Festus (526. 11 Th.) quotes from an old Augural Prayer *bene sponsis beneque uolueris.* In the time of Plautus *faxim* is still in full life. He normally uses *caue faxis*, &c., and not (except at the end of a line, i.e. for metrical convenience) *caue feceris.* But by the time of Terence this old form is restricted to certain definite formulas, e.g. *Haut.* 161 *Utinam ita di faxint*, 187 *caue faxis*, Hec. 102 *Ita di deaeque faxint*, 354 *utinam istuc ita di faxint.* The disyllabic pronunciation of *deae* in this formula in its occurrence here marks ceremonious or deliberate utterance, for the more usual scansion in Plautus is *di deaeque.* The phrase *ita di faxint* is very common in Plautus in echoing another's prayer, e.g. *Aul.* 787 *quae res tibi et gnatae tuae, Bene feliciterque uortat.* '*Ita di faxint*' *inquito*; Aul. 257 A. [*Istuc*] *di bene uortant.* B. *Ita di faxint.* **Num quo.** *Num, numquis*, &c., do not necessarily expect a negative answer in Plautus. Thus the question 'Any news?' is expressed by *num* in *Most.* 999:

Numquid processit ad forum hic hodie noui?

173. That the MSS. should change an unfamiliar form *uocatu's* into a familiar *uocatus es* is more likely than the contrary change. We must suppose the omission of *es* to be accidental and not designed. **Nusquam.** Both *nusquam* and *usquam* are often used after verbs of motion in the

Sed quid tu id quaeris? ERG. Quia mi est natalis dies:
Propterea <a> te uocari ad te ad cenam uolo.
HEG. Facete dictum. Sed si pauxillum potes

174. quid tu *BD*: quid diu *VEJ* queris *libri* (*corr. E*) HEG. *libri*: *corr. Spengelius* mihi (michi *E*) est *libri* 175. te uoc. ad te nam uolo *libri* (*ex* te uoc. ad te ad nam uolo *B*: te uoc. ad cenam uolo *J*): *corr. Schoellius* 176. ERG. *libri*: *corr. Spengelius* pauxillo '*libri veteres plerique*' *Lambini*

Dramatists, e.g. Ter. *Adel.* 246 *nusquam abeo* (see note on v. 192). **Quod sciam** is common in Plautus, after positive as well as after negative statements, e.g. *Most.* 1010 A. *Minas quadraginta accepisti, quod sciam, A Philolachete.* B. *Numquam nummum, quod sciam.*

175. The birthday feast was given by the person whose birthday was celebrated. Ergasilus wishes to vary the practice. The point of the joke would be lost, if we followed the MSS. in assigning *sed...cenam* (vv. 172—3) to Hegio, *nusquam...quaeris* (vv. 173—4) to Ergasilus, and *quia*, &c. to Hegio. We have a description of *nataliciae dapes* in *Pers.* 768 sqq. (cf. *Pseud.* 165 sqq.). **Ad te ad cenam.** See note on v. 831. The scribes of our MSS. have found difficulty in the transcription of the phrase in this line, as also in *Mil.* 712, *Stich.* 511.

176. **Facete dictum,** 'well put,' a current phrase, e.g. *Poen.* 637, Ter. *Eun.* 288. Cf. Cic. *Off.* i. 29. 104 *facete dicta...quae vocant ἀποφθέγματα.* **Pauxillum,** 'you must shew just a little contentment.' The reading is very doubtful. *Pauxillo*, which Lambinus ascribes to his 'veteres libri' (an authority that is sometimes valueless, sometimes most valuable), is adopted by most editors, and is what we should expect to find with *contentus esse*, 'to be content with very little.' Since *-um* had come in Late Latin to be pronounced *-o* (cf. Ital. *vino* for Lat. *vinum*), mediaeval scribes were familiar with the misspelling *-o* for *-um* and often changed *-o* to *-um* without cause. Thus *malo* may have been wrongly changed to *malum* in *Bacch.* 463, *caue malo* (*malum* MSS.), by some scribe who did not know the Plautine construction of *caveo* with the Dat. (e.g. *Pers.* 369 *malo cauere meliust te*). But would a scribe be likely in this line to change the easily intelligible *pauxillo contentus esse* to the 'lectio difficilior' *pauxillum*? If we read *pauxillo* in this line, we should read *perpauxillo* in the next line. This reading has the support of a correction in one MS., which however is clearly due to the following *modo*. The archetype, we may be sure, had *perpauxillum.* Leo defends *perpauxillum* (beside *pauxillo* of this line) by the supposition that Ergasilus is punning on the two senses of *esse*, as in *Vidul.* 37 sq.:

> *A.* Heus tu, a meis illic estur <satis duru>s c<ibus>.
> *B.* Misero male esse <fuerit> consentaneum.

But the pun is surely improved by reading *pauxillum* here. The unusual

Contentus esse. Erg. Ne perpauxillum modo:
Nam istoc me assiduo uictu delecto domi.
Age sis, roga emptum: 'nisi qui meliorem adferet
Quae mihi atque amicis placeat condicio magis.'
Quasi fundum uendam, meis me addicam legibus.

---

177. Contemptus *libri* (*corr. J*) *Hegionis pers. ante* Ne *habent libri* perpauxillo *ex* -illum *D* 178. uictum *D* 179. Aie *libri* (Age *J*) emtum *BD*V^1: emptum V^2*E*: eptum *J* afferet *J* 180. Que *BD* michi *EJ*: mi *edd.* condicio *D*: conditio *ceteri* 181. profundum *D*

---

form of expression *pauxillum contentus esse*, 'to shew a little contentment,' instead of *pauxillo contentus esse*, 'to be content with very little,' is exactly the kind of way that Plautus or any Comedian leads up to a pun. On the whole I prefer to follow the MSS.

177. **Ne...modo**, 'provided that it is not.' Ter. *Adel.* 835 *ne nimium modo Bonae tuae istae nos rationes, Micio, Et tuos iste animus aequos subuortat*; Tibull. II. iii. 67 *O valeant fruges, ne sint modo rure puellae.* We have often *dum ne* to express this meaning, e.g. v. 338 (see note), and in affirmative sentences *dum modo*, e.g. Ter. *Haut.* 641 *quiduis satis est, dum uiuat modo.*

178. **Assiduo** is the Adverb (used, e.g. in a pun with *accubuo*, Truc. 422), not the Adjective (*urbani assidui ciues quos scurras uocant* Trin. 202).

179 sqq. This and the four following verses are regarded by Schoell as a dittography of v. 191 (see note on vv. 46—51). He supposes that the similar ending (*domi*) of vv. 178, 190 was the cause of their transposition to this context.

179. **Roga emptum** (Supine, like *nuptum dare*, *essum vocare*, &c.), the legal phrase, as in the *Digest* (XVIII. 1, l. xli.): *cum ab eo, qui fundum alii obligatum habebat, quidam sic emptum rogasset.* **Nisi qui**, &c., a travesty of the legal formula, e.g. *Digest* XVIII. 2. i. *ille fundus centum esto tibi emptum, nisi si quis intra Kal. Jan. proximas meliorem condicionem fecerit.*

180. **Quae...condicio.** On this attraction of the Object of the sentence to the Relative clause, see note on v. 908. The legal term *condicio* is again applied to a dinner-invitation by Martial XI. lii. 1 *Cenabis belle, Juli Cerealis, apud me; Condicio est melior si tibi nulla, veni.*

181. **Meis legibus**, the opposite of our 'without reserve.' Cf. *Asin.* 234 *in leges meas Dabo, ut scire possis, perpetuom annum hunc mihi uti seruiat.*

HEG. Profundum uendis tu quidem, haud fundum, mihi.
Sed si uenturu's, temperi. ERG. Em, uel iam otium est.
HEG. I modo, uenare leporem: nunc irim tenes:
Nam meus scruposam uictus commetat uiam.
ERG. Numquam istoc uinces me, Hegio: ne postules:

182. *Parasito dat J*: *pers. om. ceteri* haut *VE* michi *E* 183. Set *E* tempori *libri* (*J n. l.*) *pers. spat. D* (*J n. l.*) ocium *BD* 184. *pers. om. libri*: *add.* ς 185. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 537 'non meus scruposam uictus conmeat uiam' Non *libri*: *corr. Pylades* scruposam (scr- *ex* scc- *ut vid.*) *D* commeat *E* 186. *Parasiti pers. om. VJ* Nunquam *J* istuc *D*² *ut vid.* heio *BV*¹ (*corr. V*²) *E*: egio *J*

182. **Profundum**, the abyss of the sea, the only sense of the word in the Dramatists, to whom the Adj. *profundus* is unknown. Similarly *barathrum* in *Curc.* 121 is used of an insatiable appetite: *age, effunde hoc cito in barathrum, propere prolue cloacam.*

183. **Temperi.** This spelling is attested by the MSS. in v. 191. In *Pseud.* 1182 the Ambrosian Palimpsest has *temperei* (*temperi* P); and this is probably the genuine old spelling which has been changed by scribes, sometimes merely to *temperi*, but often by a further corruption to *tempori* (*Capt.* 191 *temperi* P^BD, *tempori* V²EJ; *Cas.* 412 *temperi* P^BD, *tempori* B²; *Pseud.* 387 *temperi* A, gloss. Plaut., *tempori* P) and even *tempore* (*Epid.* 406 *P*, *A n. l.*; *Men.* 1020 *P*, *A n. l.*; *Asin.* 733 *P*, *A n. l.*). The last may point to an old spelling *tempere* (with O. Lat. *E* the symbol of the *ei*-diphthong), of which we have a faint trace in *Merc.* 990 (*temper edepol* P^CD, *temperare edepol* B). **Em.** *Amph.* 307 *em nunciam ergo*, Epid. 270 *em Nunc occasiost faciundi.* **Vel**, as in vv. 90, 132.

184. **Irim**, the old name for the hedgehog, the derivatives *ericius* (Varro *Men.* 490 Buech.) or *iricius* (Ital. *riccio*, Span. *erizo* indicate *-ric-*) and *erinaceus* taking its place later. (In Nemesianus *Cyneg.* 57 the traditional spelling is *ĕrem* Acc.) Erasmus proposed *ictim* on the strength of Diogen. iii. 84 οἱ γαλῆν ἔχοντες οὐκ εὐτυχοῦσιν. But *irim* is specially appropriate to Hegio's account of his fare (vv. 185, 188).

185. **Nam**, if expressed in an early archetype by the contraction *N* with a stroke above, which was also the contraction for *non*, would readily be miscopied as *non*. Some however retain *non* in the sense of *nonne.* **Commetat**, Frequentative of *commeo*, occurs elsewhere in the Dramatists, e.g. Ter. *Haut.* 444, Novius *Com.* 7 R. *Cum ad lupam nostram tam multi crebro conmetant lupi.*

186. **Numquam istoc uinces me.** *Stich.* 756 *Numquam edepol med istoc uinces* (followed by *quin* and Subj.), *Merc.* 438 *Numquam edepol me uincet hodie.* **Ne postules**, 'do not expect it' (see note on v. 717).

Cum calceatis dentibus ueniam tamen.
HEG. Asper meus uictus sane est. ERG. Sentisne essitas?
HEG. Terrestris cena est. ERG. Sus terrestris bestia est. 189
HEG. Multis holeribus. ERG. Curato aegrotos domi.
Numquid uis? HEG. Venias temperi. ERG. Memorem mones.—

---

188. HE. *om. D* Aspers V^1 (*corr.* V^2) ER. *Saracenus*: *pers. sp. BD*: *om. VEJ* essit os *ex* essitas *ut vid. D* 189. HE. *Saracenus*: *om. libri* caena *VJ* *pers. sp. D* 190. HE. ς: *om. libri* oleribus *VEJ* *pers. sp. libri* (SEN. *J*) egrotos *VE* 191. PAR. *praescr. J* temperi BDV^1: tempori V^2EJ

---

187. **Tamen** (see note on v. 404).

188. **Sane** is rather to be understood in its usual sense of *valde* (Charisius, p. 218. 8 K., Priscian II. p. 71. 12 K.), as in *Asin.* prol. 8 *Nam quod ad argumentum attinet, sane breuest*, and many other lines, than in the concessive sense of 'yes, I allow, my fare does require booted teeth.' **Sentis.** This jest is treasured by the Parasite and reproduced in v. 860. **Essitas** (see note on v. 83).

189. **Terrestris cena,** i.e. of vegetables (*terrâ nata* or *enata*). Paul. Fest. 38. 1 Th. *Centenariae cenae dicebantur, in quas lege Licinia non plus centussibus praeter terra enata inpendebatur*; Cic. *Fam.* vii. 26 *Lex sumptuaria...mihi fraudi fuit. Nam dum volunt isti lauti terra nata, quae lege excepta sunt, in honorem adducere, fungos, heluellas, herbas omnis ita condiunt, ut nihil possit esse sua.* See also Aul. Gell. ii. 24, where the terms of the Lex Licinia are stated: *quidquid esset tamen e terra, vite, arbore promisce atque indefinite largita est.* **Terrestris bestia.** Cic. *Deor. Nat.* i. 37. 103 (*bestiarum autem terrenae sunt aliae, partim aquatiles, aliae quasi ancipites*) uses the later Adj. *terrenus*.

190. **Multis holeribus,** Abl. of Description (see note on v. 170). Ergasilus understands it as Abl. of Instrument. **Curato** (see note on v. 114).

191. **Numquid uis?**, the regular formula of leave-taking. Donatus ad Ter. *Eun.* II. iii. 50 *recte abituri, ne id dure facerent, 'numquid vis?' dicebant iis, quibuscum constitissent.* Variations are found in *Trin.* 198 *Numquid, prius quam abeo, me rogaturu's?*, Mil. 575 *Numquid nunc aliud me uis?* &c. (see note on v. 448). **Temperi** (see note on v. 183). **Memorem mones,** a proverb. *Stich.* 578 A. *Ludificemur hominem.* B. *Capti consili memorem mones* (cf. *Pseud.* 940).

HEG. Ibo intro atque intus subducam ratiunculam,
Quantillum argentum mi apud tarpezitam siet.

---

192. HE. *om.* *D* rctiunculam (o *ex* ā) *D* 193. mihi *libri* (michi *J*) trapeizitam *B*: trapezitam *DV*[1]*E*: trapezetam *V*[2]: trapazetam *J*

---

192 sqq. Ergasilus leaves the stage by the right-hand door (from the spectators; see p. 112) for the *forum* (v. 478). Hegio repeats his intention of visiting the other batch of prisoners in his brother's *ergastulum* (a visit which leads to the discovery of the Captives' plot in Act III.), but decides to postpone it.

192. **Intro...intus.** This line is a good illustration of the correct use of these two Adverbs in accordance with Lucilius' rule (ix. 59 M.):

Intro nos uocat ad sese, tenet intus apud se.

The use of *intus* for *intro* (motion to within), which is condemned by Quintilian as a solecism (i. 5. 51 'eo' tamen 'intus' et 'intro sum' soloecismi sunt), is not found in Plautus (cf. *Asin.* 941). But *intus* is common in another sense, of motion from within; and that is the original sense both of *intus* and of all Adverbs in *-tus*, e.g. *penitus* (*Pseud.* 132 *Atque ipse egreditur penitus, peiuri caput*), *funditus*, *radicitus*, &c. The termination (Greek -τος of ἐντός, ἐκτός) soon acquired the sense of rest within, the usual sense of *penitus* and a common sense of *subtus* (e.g. Cato *R. R.* xlviii. 2 *uti subtus homo ambulare possit*), and indeed was extended till it became a mere Adverbial ending without any local sense, e.g. *publicitus*, *sollemnitus*, &c. **Subducam.** *Curc.* 371 *Beatus uideor: subduxi ratiunculam, Quantum aeris mihi sit quantumque alieni siet: Diues sum, si non reddo eis quibus debeo.* On the rhythm *sub|ducám|*, see v. 24.

193. **Quantillum.** Cf. *Bacch.* 320 *nescio Quantillum attulerit; uerum haud permultum attulit.* Apparently Hegio's purchases of Elean prisoners (vv. 27, 98 sqq.) had been so extensive as to make him apprehensive of a small balance of ready money at his banker's (cf. *ratiunculam*, v. 192). In v. 449 he gives a cheque on his banker for Philocrates' travelling expenses. **Tarpezitam.** The Greek τραπεζίτης was in everyday language perverted to *tarpezita* (*tarpessita*), a form required by the metre in three passages of Plautus (*Curc.* 341, 406, 712) and possible in all, with one exception, *Epid.* 143 *Díc modo unde auférre me uis. á quo trapĕzitá peto?* Since the Preposition is usually put after the Interrogative in Plautus, it is extremely probable that the true reading is *quo a tarpezita peto*, so that *tarpezita*, although altered by scribes to *trapezita*, was in all likelihood the only form recognized by Plautus. Others prefer to suppose both forms, *trapezita* and *tarpezita*, to have been used by Plautus, as he uses *Phrygio* (passim) and *Phyrgio* (*Aul.* 508) (cf. Introd. ii. § 10). **Siet.** The Optative of *sum*

[redacted]

Ad fratrem, quo ire dixeram, mox iero.—

---

was originally declined *siem*, *siēs*, *siēt* (cf. Greek ἐ(σ)ίην, ἐ(σ)ίης, ἐ(σ)ίη(τ), *sīmus* (older *-os*), *sītis* (older *-es*), *sient*. In course of time *-i-* of *simus*, *sitis* took the place of *-ie-* of *siem*, &c., so that the declension became *sim*, *sis*, *sit*, *simus*, *sitis*, *sint*. In the time of Plautus the older forms are in process of disappearing. We find them chiefly employed 'metri causa,' at the end of the line or hemistich, as here. Sometimes the MSS. retain the old spelling, where the metre requires the new form, e.g. *Amph.* 979.

194. **Dixeram** (in v. 126). On the tense see note on v. 17. Here we must supply 'before I met Ergasilus.' **Ire dixeram** (see note on v. 365). **Iero**, with first syllable long. We generally write *iuero* and *iero*, but I prefer to keep to the spelling of the MSS. here, in view of Donatus' note on Ter. *Adel.* I. i. 2 '*ierant*' *producte i pronuntiando, quod nos addita v* '*iverant*' *dicimus.* (Cf. *Stich.* 484.) It seems difficult to draw any sharp line between the Fut. Perf. and the Fut. in Plautus. Metrical considerations determine the use of the former as much as anything else, its usual place being at the end of the line or hemistich (cf. vv. 293, 340, 494). For its equivalence with the Fut. cf. *Asin.* 280 *Eros in obsidione linquet, inimicum animos auxerit*, Trin. 463 *Oculum ego ecfodiam tibi, si uerbum addideris*, beside *Rud.* 1401 *Vapulabis, uerbum si addes istuc unum.*

Act II. Scene i. The chief *lorarius* comes out of the house with his assistants (followed by some of the other slaves, v. 211) to execute the orders given by Hegio (vv. 110 sqq.). The opening passage (vv. 195 sqq.) is spoken while the change of fetters is being made. In accordance with the policy of kind treatment enjoined by Hegio (v. 114), Tyndarus, who is playing the part of the master, asks and obtains permission to have a private conversation with Philocrates, his pretended slave, in which the scheme for Philocrates' release is discussed.

The metrical arrangement of this 'mutatis modis canticum' (Cretics, Bacchiacs, &c.) is made difficult by the fact that the archetype (*P*) of our MSS. had not observed with care the division of the lines in lyric passages. The arrangement of the Cantica according to the method of colometry prescribed by the Alexandrian editors of the Greek Dramatists (see Introd. i. § 13) is followed in the Ambrosian Palimpsest and was also followed apparently in the proto-archetype (P^A) of the other MSS. In one copy of this last, the Codex Turnebi (*T*), the division of the lines was accurately rendered, but in that copy (*P*) from which our extant MSS. have been derived, it was abandoned over and over again for the sake of saving space. While the division of long lines was, as a rule, retained, short lines were often written together, the only trace of the previous arrangement being here and there a capital letter in the middle of the new line, at the place where the old line had begun (see Introd. iii. § 5). Thus in the case of Cantica, like this one, for which we have neither the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest nor of the Codex Turnebi, one cannot be sure when

LORARII. PHILOCRATES, TYNDARVS captiui. II. i.

LORARIUS. Si di inmortales id uoluerunt, uos hanc aerumnam exsequi,

---

II. i. LOLARII (*sequitur nomen eras.*) PHILOCRATES CAPTIVI TYNDARVS (*ex* TYD-) *B*: LOLARII PHILOCRATES PHILOCRATES TYNDARVS V^1 (TVND-) *E*: LOLARII PHILOCRATES TINDARVS V^2 (TVND-) *J*: *unius v. spat., iuxta quem* LOR. *eras.*, *D*

195. Si *BD* (s *in marg.*): i *cum sp. init.* V^1E: Di V^2: Dii *J* di *D*: dii *BVEJ* inm- *V*: imm- *cett.* uos an *E*: uos han V^1 (*corr.* V^2) erumnam *E*: erumpnam *J* exequi *EV* (*ex* -quam) (*J n.l.*).

---

a line in the MSS. represents a line or two lines or a line and a half of the original. In this Canticum, however, short lines are frequent in the MSS. (e.g. vv. 197, 204, 205, 206ᵃ, 206ᵇ, &c.), so that we may conclude that the older distribution has hardly, if at all, been departed from.

Another difficulty is that we have not specimens extant of the models on which the Plautine Cantica were constructed (Introd. iii. § 2). These must have been developements of the choruses of the later Attic dramatists, Euripides and his successors, but how precisely they had diverged from the original type we cannot tell. An editor of Plautus is always exposed to the danger of associating metres whose association Plautus would never have tolerated, or of imposing a scansion on lines which is made possible by the elastic prosody of Plautine Latin, but which Plautus never intended the line to bear.

The arrangement in this edition supposes the Canticum to begin with an Iambic passage, Octonarii (Tetrameters Acatalectic) varied in v. 197 by a Dimeter and terminated by a Septenarius (Tetr. Catal.) v. 200. The transition to Cretics (vv. 204 sqq.) is marked by the Trochaic lines (v. 201 and probably v. 203), which are interrupted by a reversion to the Iambic rhythm in v. 202, where a proverbial maxim is put in its natural setting, an Iambic Senarius. The Cretic passage is interrupted by an Iambic 'echo' (v. 206ᵃ, an Iambic Dimeter), and is terminated by an Ithyphallic colon (v. 207 *sentio...agitis*), which is found elsewhere at the end of Cretics (e.g. *Curc.* 121, *Pseud.* 264). Two Trochaic Octonarii convey Tyndarus' protest and the reply of the *lorarius* (vv. 208—209). Then the Cretic Metre is resumed and continues (interrupted by a Trochaic Octonarius at v. 215) until v. 222. A couple of Iambic Tetrameters (catalectic and acatalectic) prepare the way for Bacchiacs (vv. 226—230). Then some mixed Anapaestic and Iambic lines (vv. 231—3) form a transition to Cretics (vv. 234—239). Finally two Trochaic Octonarii (vv. 240—1) open the dialogue-metre (Troch. Septenarii) with which the Scene is concluded.

195. **Si** expresses a fact, as in vv. 121, 198, 545, &c. **Voluerunt.**

Decet id pati animo aequo: si id facietis, leuior labos erit.
Domi fuistis, credo, liberi:
Nunc seruitus si euenit, ei uos morigerari mos bonust
Et erili imperio eamque ingeniis uostris lenem reddere.

---

196. patri *E* aequo animo *J*: animo equo *E* fatietis *E* liuior *VE* (*ex* liuor) *post* labos 3 *litt. spat. D* 197. *post* fuistis 2 *litt. sp. ut vid. D* 198. seruitutis *E* sic euenit *J* et uos *D* bonus est V^2J 199. Eamque et er. imp. *libri*: *corr. Nettleshipius* ('*Lect. and Ess.*' *p.* 343); *cf. Niemeyerus Stud. Plaut.* 6 *sq.* herili *DVJ* uostris *ex* niostris *B* (i *eras.*): uestris (ūris) *ex* nostris *D*: uostris *VE*: nostris *J*

There is no need to change this to *uoluere* so as to obtain an Iambus in the fourth foot (Introd. iii. § 11). **Aerumnam exsequi.** Cf. *Trin.* 686 *egestatem exsequi.*

196. **Id,** 'it,' need not refer to *aerumna*, though this loose use of the Neuter Pronoun is common in the colloquial Latin of Plautus (see note on v. 898). Thus *id* often refers to a sum of money which has not been expressed by a Neut. Sing. word, e.g. *Trin.* 153 *nummorum Philippeum ad tria milia, Id...ne gnato crederem*, Aul. 109 *argenti nummos...Id si relinquo ac non peto.* **Animo aequo.** Both *animo aequo* (less common in Terence) and *aequo animo* are approved by Plautus, the two words never being separated from each other. **Labos** (*Merc.* 72, *Trin.* 271, *Truc.* 521) may have been the only form used by our author, in which case *labor* of the MSS. in *Curc.* 219 (*P*, *A n. l.*), *Rud.* 202 (*P*, *A n. l.*) will be a scribe's alteration. The word is here to be scanned as a pyrrich.

197. **Fuistis,** here a disyllable (Introd. ii. § 15). This remark of the *lorarius* is strange, since Philocrates was playing the part of a slave. We must suppose that Philocrates had been giving the same account of himself to the *lorarius* as he afterwards does to Hegio (vv. 272—273):

non multum fuit molesta seruitus,
Nec mihi secus erat quam si essem familiaris filius.

198. **Ei,** a monosyllable. This is the usual pronunciation of the word in the dialogue of Plautus, except where it is emphatic (Introd. ii. §§ 6, 15). **Morigerari mos.** For the jingle, see note on v. 107.

199. **Et erili imperio eamque.** Nettleship's correction of the reading of the MSS. *Eamque et erili imperio* is very convincing. The scribe of some archetype had wrongly begun the line with *eamque*, and after the manner of mediaeval scribes did not acknowledge his mistake by erasing or expunging the word, but left the miswriting uncorrected (see note on v. 201). **Ingeniis uostris** Abl. Cf. v. 371 *Tute tibi tuopte ingenio prodes plurumum, Quom seruitutem* <*tu*> *ita fers ut ferri decet.*

Indigna digna habenda sunt, erus quae facit. CAPTIVI. Oh! oh! oh!
LOR. Eiulatione haud opus est: oculis multa mira aitis.
In re mala animo si bono utare, adiuuat.
TYNDARVS. At nos pudet quia cum catenis sumus. LOR. At pigeat postea

---

200. herus V^2J fecit *V* 200—214. CAPT. *vel.* CA. *praem. libri*: *inde a v.* 203 TYN. *pro* CA. *Pareus scripsit* oho hoh *libri*: *suo in versu scrips. Brixius*: *in initio v. sequentis Schoellius* 201. Euilatione *B* haut *E* multa oculis multa miraclitis *libri* (miraclitis *an* miraditis *incert. DV*: mira litis *ex* miraclitis *J*): *correxi* 202. utare *ex* utari *ut vid. D*: utare *ex* utere *V* 203. *Post* pudet 6 *litt. ras. J* catenatis *B* ad *libri* (*corr. J*)

---

200. For the sentiment cf. *Amph.* 171 sqq., *Aul.* 587 sq. **Oh oh oh.** Most editors put these words in a separate line 'extra metrum' and make the line *Indigna...facit* an Iambic Senarius. When a single *oh* stands at the end of a line in Plautus or Terence, it is always preceded by elision.

201. **Eiulatione**, from *eiulo*, 'I cry *ei!*,' a verb which must be pronounced 'ei-yulo,' not 'ĕ-yulo.' **Oculis multa mira aitis**, a conjectural emendation of the corrupt reading of the archetype of our MSS., *multa oculis multa miraclitis* (or *miraditis*, with the well-known similarity of *d* and *cl* in minuscule script). I suppose the first *multa* to have been written in its wrong place by the scribe and left undeleted (see note on v. 199), while in *cl* (or *d*) I find a miscopying of a peculiar form of *a* that is current in early minuscule (see note on *aio*, v. 1. *dio*, v. 72). The form *aitis* seems to have been recognized by Grammarians of the Empire, for Alcuin, their imitator, says (2118 P.): *aio 'ais,' 'ait' et 'aitis,' 'aiunt' facit, in prima plurali deficit*; though whether pronounced *aïtis* (like *aïs*, *aït*) or $\widehat{ai}$*tis* (like $\widehat{ai}$*bam*, $\widehat{ai}$*s*, $\widehat{ai}$*t*) is not clear. The reading I adopt in this line requires *aïtis.* The second *multa* might also be a corruption of *muti* (through *multi*), which would give: *multa oculis muti mira* $\widehat{ai}$*tis.*

202. *Pseud.* 452 *Bonus animus in mala re dimidiumst mali.* On the phrase *bonus animus* (the normal order), see note on v. 152. The normal order too is *mala res* (a word-group; see Appendix), when this phrase is an equivalent of *malum*, 'punishment'; but the reverse order in this line is not unnatural. Cf. Laberius *Com.* 79 R. *Ne in re bona esse uideam nequam filium.*

203. I take this line to be, like v. 201, Trochaic (though this involves the awkward scansion of *pudĕt quia* as a Proceleusmatic), because Trochaics are so often used to smooth the passage of Iambic into Cretic Metre. But

[redacted]

Nostrum erum, si uos eximat uinclis,
Aut solutos sinat, quos argento emerit. 205
TYND. Quid a nobis metuit? Scimus nos 206a
Nostrum officium quod est, si solutos sinat. 206b
LOR. At fugam fingitis: sentio quam rem agitis.

---

204. herum *J* si suos *Spengelius* uinculis *libri* 205. At *J* solutor V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *EJ* sinatque quos *libri*: *corr.* ς 206. a nobis *ex* a uobis *V* offitium *V*: officium (c *ex* t) *E* 207. fugam (f *ex corr.*) *D* fingitis *BD* (*ex* fu-): fugitis *VEJ* scio *J* quem *V* agis *Hermannus*

---

the line may be Iambic, like the preceding. **Pudet...pigeat**, a favourite contrast with a Roman. Cf. *Trin.* 345 *Pol pudere quam pigere praestat totidem litteris*, Pseud. 281 *Nimio id quod pudet facilius fertur quam illud quod piget.* **Quia** (see note on v. 153). **Cum catenis sumus**, like *cum telo esse*, 'to carry a weapon.'

204. **Vinclis.** The disyllabic form is normal in Plautus, though the trisyllabic would be legitimate at the end of a line (see note on v. 740). One is tempted to accept Spengel's emendation of *uos* to *suos* and make the line a regular Cretic Tetrameter:

Nóstrum erum sí suos éximat uínculis,

like the following line. But the curtailed dimeter *Nóstrum erum sí uos* is conceivable and would naturally be followed by a dimeter similarly curtailed (see Introd. iii. § 38).

205. **Emerit** is attracted into the Subjunctive by *eximat* and *sinat.* (See note on v. 467.)

206a seems to be an Iambic Dimeter, with *quid ă nóbis*, and *scimŭs nos* (Introd. ii. §§ 21, 3). It can hardly be scanned as a Bacchiac Trimeter, for *scimŭs nos* would violate the law that when the line ends in a monosyllable, the last foot cannot be a Molossus.

206b. **Officium quod est** for *officium* alone, a common usage of colloquial Latin. Cf. *Aul.* 107 *Nam noster nostrae qui est magister curiae*, *Pseud.* 460 *Decet innocentem qui sit atque innoxium Seruom superbum esse apud erum potissimum*, Epid. 606 *Si inuenio, exitiabilem ego illi faciam hunc ut fiat diem.* Our sentence corresponds to the phrase *officium scire* without *quod est*, which occurs e.g. in *Poen.* prol. 12 *Iam dudum exspecto, si tuom officium scias*, Pers. 616 *quanquam ego serua sum, Scio ego officium meum*, rather than to *officium scire quid sit*, e.g. *Cist.* 164 *Quoniam reum eius facti nescit qui siet*, Bacch. 473 *ego omnem rem scio Quem ad modumst.*

207. **Fingitis**, 'you are contriving.' Lucil. xxviii. 57 M. *Sed fuga fingitur, ut timido pede percitu' uadit!* See note on *confinxerunt* v. 35.

TYND. Nos fugiamus? Quo fugiamus? LOR. In patriam. TYND. Apage, haud nos id deceat,
Fugitiuos imitari. LOR. Immo edepol, si erit occasio, haud dehortor.
TYND. Vnum exorare uos sinite nos. LOR. Quidnam id est? TYND. Vt sine hisce arbitris 210, 211
Atque uobis nobis detis locum loquendi.

---

208. apage *om.* *J* had V^1 (*corr.* V^2): hud *E* id deceat (*ex* idideceat *ut vid.*) *B*: dideceat DV^1E: decet (*om.* id) V^2J 211. sinebis *D*: sine hisce *ex* sine bisce *V* 212. uobis *ex* nobis *B* locum *ex* loq- *E* loquendi locum *D* *ante corr.*

Sentio quam rem agitis seems to be an Ithyphallic colon (–⏑⏑–⏓–⏑), like *detis locum loquendi* v. 212. With *agis* the line is a Cretic Tetram.

209. **Dehortor.** If this word is a trisyllable (cf. *Poen.* 674 *Neque nôs hortari néque dehortarí decet*), the line is a Trochaic Octonarius, like the preceding. If the vowel of the Preposition is elided (see note on v. 640), it will be a Septenarius. Schoell makes the line Anapaestic.

210, 211. Editors are perhaps right in breaking this up into two Cretic lines, a Tetrameter (*Únum...est*) and a Dimeter (*Út...arbitris*). But we have not much reason to believe that the original colometry was departed from in this canticum by the archetype of our MSS. **Exorare ...sinite.** *Sino* takes the Inf. or the Subj. (without *ut*) in Plautus, e.g. *Cas.* 136 *Sine tuos ocellos deosculer, uoluptas mea, Sine amabo ted amari*, *Most.* 12 *Sine modo aduenïat senex: Sine modo uenire saluom.* "*Exorare*, like *orare*, takes (1) acc. pers., 'to persuade,' 'prevail upon,' (2) acc. rei, 'to ask successfully,' 'to obtain,' and sometimes (3) both accusatives, as here and *Bacch.* 1199 *hanc ueniam illis sine te exorem*, Ter. *Andr.* 901 *sine te hoc exorem.*" Hallidie. **Hisce** (see note on v. 34). **Arbitris** (see note on v. 219). The *arbitri* referred to are the slaves whom the *lorarius* had brought with him to act as guards of the Captives, according to Hegio's orders (v. 115), and whom he leaves behind when he and his assistants (*uobis* v. 212) leave the stage (v. 215). It is they who are again addressed by Hegio in v. 456.

212. Schoell regards *atque uobis* as a spurious accretion (produced by a miswriting *uobis* for *nobis*?) (see note on v. 199). By transposing *locum* and *loquendi* we should then have a Cretic Trimeter:

Nóbis detís loquendí locum.

But this would be to re-write the passage. **Detis locum loquendi** is an Ithyphallic colon (cf. ad v. 207).

[redacted]

LOR. Fiat. Abscedite hinc: nos concedamus huc. Sed
breuem orationem incipisse. 213, 214
TY. Em istuc mihi certum erat. Concede huc. LOR. [Ab-]
ite ab istis. TYND. Obnoxii ambo 215
Vobis sumus propter hanc rem, cum quae uolumus nos

213, 214. uos V^2J set *E* oracionem *J* incipisse *D ante corr. J*: incipesse *BD ex corr. VE* 215. TYND. *Pareus*: PHIL. *libri* (*om. D*) Hem *J* mihi *om. E* *pers. spat. D* abite ab illis *D*: abite ab istis *ex* abistis abite *E*: *correxi* *pers. spat. D* obnoxu V^1 (*corr.* V^2): obnixii *J*: obnoxi *Schoellius* 216. Ubi V^1 (*corr.* V^2) cumque *libri* (*corr.* V^2)

---

213. **Fiat,** 'it shall be done,' a common form of assent to a request or command, e.g. *Asin.* 39 A. *Despuas.* B. *Fiat, geratur mos tibi,* Men. 158 A. *Concede huc a foribus.* B. *Fiat.* **Abscedite,** to the guards, the *arbitri* of v. 211 (see note). Brix refers it to the Captives. **Huc,** into the house. *Concedo* generally expresses retiring into a corner of the stage for observation (e.g. *Pseud.* 414), but not always (e.g. *Pseud.* 571, of leaving the stage and going into the house). This line also (like vv. 210, 211) is written by editors as two Cretic lines, the first a Tetrameter (*Fiat...huc*), the second a Dimeter (*Sed breuem oration(em)*) followed by a Trochaic Monometer (*incipisse*). The next is also conveniently divided into an Anapaestic Dimeter (*Em...huc*) and a line composed of two Bacchiac cola (or 'cola Reiziana') *Abite* | *ab istis.* || *Obnox*|*ii ambo.* I retain the single line arrangement (cf. p. 172) and suppose that *abite ab* is a corruption of *ite ab* (as in *Trin.* 67 *ad te aduenio* P, *ad te uenio* A). The line will then be a Trochaic Octonarius. Schoell makes it an Anapaestic Octonarius (Tetram. Acat.) by reading *abite* as *ăbite* (from *a-bito*, *ab-bito*) and changing *obnoxii* to *obnoxi* (from a supposed by-form *obnoxus*, like *noxa* beside *noxia*).

214. **Incipisse.** See note on v. 802.

215. **Abite ab istis.** The *lorarius*, as he leaves the stage with his assistants, repeats his command of v. 213. **Obnoxii,** 'indebted.' Cf. *Asin.* 284 *Adeo ut aetatem ambo ambobus nobis sint obnoxii, Nostro deuincti beneficio.*

216. **Quae** for *eorum quae.* "This ellipse of an antecedent pronoun is less harsh where the antecedent would have been in the same case as the relative, e.g. v. 743 *breue spatiumst perferundi* (*ea*) *quae minitas mihi,* Virg. *Ecl.* ii. 71 *aliquid saltem potius* (*eorum*) *quorum indiget usus,* or where the antecedent is the subject or direct object of the principal verb, e.g. *Pseud.* 1217 *quae facie fuit* (*ille*) *quoi dedisti sumbolum?*, infra v. 985 *mos est obliuisci* (*eius*) *neque nouisse* (*eum*) *quoius....* But in cases like the text it is rarer; cf., however, v. 265, *Amph.* 318 *os* (*eius*)...*quem percusseris,*

Copia est; ea facitis nos compotes.
PHIL. Secede huc nunciam, si uidetur, procul,
Ne arbitri dicta nostra arbitrari queant
Neue permanet palam haec nostra fallacia.
Nam doli non doli sunt, ni<si> astu colas,

---

217. PHIL. *praem. BV¹E* (*cf. v.* 218) fa<cere quom> *Leo* 218. PHIL. *praem. V²J* (*cf. v.* 217) 220. palam *ex* palem *D* fallatia *libri* (-cia *J*) 221. ni *libri*: nisi *Camerarius*

Aul. 605 *ut* (*eorum*), *quae fierent, fieret particeps,* Men. 192 *ut superior sis mihi quam quisquam* (*eorum*) *qui impetrant,* Lucr. i. 883 *aliquid* (*eorum*) *nostro quae corpore aluntur,* Amph. 652 *omnia adsunt bona* (*ei*) *quem penest uirtus,* Curc. 590 *cupio dare mercedem* (*ei*) *qui...conmonstret,* Mil. 1077 *meri bellatores gignuntur* (*ex iis*) *quas.*" Hallidie.

217. **Copia est.** On the Ind. with *cum* see note on v. 151. **Ea** must be Abl., governed by **facitis compotes** in the sense of *compotitis,* which takes the Abl. case (*Rud.* 911 *Piscatu nouo me uberi compotiuit, Rud.* 205 *Ita hic sola solis locis compotita sum*). *Compotem facere* takes the Gen. elsewhere (vv. 41, 622) in Plautus, but we find in Accius *Trag.* 36 R. *Cur me miseram inridet magnis compotem et magnis malis?* and in Naevius *Trag.* 5 *probris compotem.* The first Dimeter will be 'contracted' (Introd. iii. § 38). Leo proposes *Copia est, fa<cere quom> facitis nos compotes,* which makes the line consist of four full Cretics. Other possibilities are (1) to remove *est,* as a miswriting of *ea* (see note on v. 199), which will give us a Cretic Trimeter Acatalectic with *copia ea* (Abl., *ea* for *eorum*) as its first Cretic foot, (2) to insert *copia* Abl. before *ea,* which will give us a Tetrameter with the same phrase as second Cretic foot, (3) to read *<uos> ea,* (4) to substitute *copia* Abl. (written *cā* in the Archetype?) for *ea.* I see no reason for departing from the MSS., though two short lines should perhaps be printed (Introd. iii. § 39).

218. **Si uidetur.** Philocrates is apprehensive of being overheard and still uses the deferential language of a slave to a master.

219. **Arbitrari,** as in *Aul.* 607 *hinc ego potero quid agant arbitrarier. Arbiter,* 'an observer,' is found in class. Latin, but not *arbitror,* 'to be an observer' (cf. *philosophor, poetor, mendicor*).

220. **Neue,** here a monosyllable, to be pronounced *neu.* **Permanet.** This Compound is used for the sake of Alliteration; cf. *Most.* 143 *Is usque in pectus permanauit, permadefecit cor meum,* Trin. 155 *Neue quoiquam unde ad eum id posset permanascere.*

221. **Nam doli non doli sunt.** Cf. the Cretic line, *Asin.* 134 *Nám mare haud ést mare, uós mare acérrumum.* **Nisi astu colas.** *Truc.* 461 *N<on> ullam rem oportet dolose adgrediri, Nisi astute accurateque exsequare* (*-ere* MSS.). Whether the reading of the MSS. *ni* (**unelided**) **can be**

[redacted]

Sed malum maxumum, si id palam prouenit.
Nam si erus mihi es tu atque ego me tuum esse seruum assimulo,
Tamen uiso opust, cauto est opus, ut hoc sobrie sineque arbitris 224, 225
Accurate agatur, docte et diligenter;
Tanta incepta res est: haud somniculose hoc

222. maxumum (*priore* u *s. v.*) *B*: maximum *EJ* 223. herus V^2 (*J n. l.*) michi *E* tu mihi's *Hermannus* asimulo *J* 224. opus est V^2 (*J n. l.*) causto est opus *D ante corr. E* sobriae *VJ* 226. Accurate hoc *libri* (e *ras. ex* ae *B*) agatur *ex* agate *D* 227. incoepta *B* somniculose (o *ex* l *et* e *ras. ex* ae) *B*

retained is doubtful (Introd. ii. § 41; cf. note on v. 103). The change to *nisi* (written in MSS. $\overset{i}{n}$) is a very slight one. **Colas,** 'practise' (cf. *quaestum colere*). The Subjunctive is used when the 2 Pers. Sing. has the indefinite sense of 'one,' 'people' in the protasis of a Conditional sentence, e.g. *Trin.* 349 *De magnis diuitiis si quid demas, plus fit an minus?* *Trin.* 409 *Non hercle minus diuorse distrahitur cito, Quam si formicis obicias papauerem.*

222. **Id.** See note on v. 196. **Prouenit.** This Compound (like *permanet*, v. 220) is chosen for the sake of Alliteration with *palam.* Its normal sense in Plautus is seen in lines like *Pers.* 456 (*rem*) *prouenturam bene confido mihi*, Rud. 837 *Edepol proueni nequiter multis modis.* But cf. *Pseud.* 568 *nam qui in scaenam prouenit, Nouo modo nouom aliquid inuentum adferre addecet.*

223. The change of metre indicates a change of tone in the speaker. Philocrates earnestly impresses the necessity of caution. **Nam si erus** &c. *Si* is emphatic, 'even though' the transformation has been successfully carried out. **Mihi es tu.** Brix and Schoell transpose *tu mi es*, following the normal order in Plautus of a Personal Pronoun in the Nom. and another in an Oblique Case (e.g. prol. 3, 314, 339, 364, 371, 434, 436, 444, 564, 571, 575, 609, 631, 727, 739, 857, 863, 870, 890, 892, 965) and helping the metre. They may be right. Still it is in Cantica, if anywhere, that we find departures from the normal order; and the rhetorical figure of Chiasmus may have played a part in the construction of this line. *Mihi* and *si* may both exhibit Hiatus.

226. The MSS. insert *hoc* before *agatur.* This will not scan, for *hŏc* is here impossible (Introd. ii. §§ 32, 23). The insertion is clearly due to an ill-timed reminiscence of *hoc* in v. 225.

227. Brix understands **tanta** to refer to what follows, *tanta incepta res est ut haud* &c. For the Parataxis, see note on v. 504.

Agendum est. TYND. Ero ut me uoles esse. PHIL. Spero.
TYND. Nam tu nunc uides pro tuo caro capite
Carum offerre <me> meum caput uilitati.
PHIL. Scio. TYND. At scire memento quando id quod uoles habebis:

228. *pro* TYND. *spat. D* hero V^2 *pro* PHIL. *spat. D* 229. TYND. *Lambinus*: *om. libri* 230. offere *B* *suppl. Hermannus, Bentleius* capud *DE* *ante* uilitati 6—7 *litt.* (uil- *ut vid.*) *ras. in B* uitilitati *J* 231. TYND. Scio. PHIL. *libri* (*nisi quod* Scio *cum spat. D*): *pers. invert. Lambinus* memento scire *Fleckeisenus* habebis (e *ex* i) *B*

230. **Offerre...uilitati** (or **Vilitati**), 'sell cheap,' a use of *offero* which finds a nearer parallel in the diction of Tragedy than of Comedy, e.g. Accius *Trag.* 117 R. *nos...leto offeres*, 360 R. *Haud dubitabit uitam offerre nec capiti pepercerit.* Cf. Lucr. iii. 1041 *Sponte sua leto caput obvius obtulit ipse.* Plautus' ordinary use of the word may be seen in v. 769. **Me** has been lost in the MSS. before *meum* through Haplography.

231. **Scire memento** is perhaps rather 'remember to know,' 'do not forget to shew knowledge' (like *Epid.* 658 *memento suppetias mihi ferre*, *Bacch.* 328 *anulum memineris ferre*, Asin. 333 *meministin uendere?*) than 'remember that you know,' 'do not forget that you possess knowledge' (like *Curc.* 490 *memento promisisse te*, Poen. 1278 *in memoria habeas te despondisse*, Truc. 220 *Nos diuitem istum meminimus atque iste pauperes nos*).

231—232. If we retain the reading of the MSS., these two lines will be catalectic Anapaestic Dimeters ending with an Iambic colon, which in v. 231 is a catalectic, in v. 232 an acatalectic Dimeter. Fleckeisen's transposition, *memento scire*, provides a smooth Iambic Septenarius in v. 231; but we cannot well find Iambic metre in the following line. Schoell effects this by omitting *maxima pars*, which he supposes to be a gloss on *fere*, and substituting for the arrangement in the MSS. a couple of Iambic Dimeters:

Nam fere morem hunc homines habent:
Quod sibi uolunt, dum id impetrant.

And yet the unusual combination of Anapaestic and Iambic Metres may be used by design to effect the transition from Bacchiacs to Cretics. Brix regards v. 232 as a Trochaic Septenarius of irregular (lyric) form. The preceding line would become Trochaic too with the insertion of *scis* as second word and the transposition of *memento* and *scire*: A. *Scio.* B. <*Scis:*> *at meménto* &c. We had better keep to the MSS.

Nam fere maxima pars morem hunc homines habent: quod sibi uolunt,
Dum id impetrant, boni sunt;
Sed id ubi iam penes sese habent,
Ex bonis pessumi et fraudulentissimi
Fiunt. PHIL. Nunc ut mihi te uolo esse autumo.
Quod tibi suadeam, suadeam meo patri.
Pol ego si te audeam, meum patrem nominem:

232. morem *ex* mortem *D* 234. penes sese (*ex* penesse *ut vid.*) *B* 235. pessumi *J*: pessimi *ceteri* (pissimi *D*) 236. Fiunt *Hermannus*: Sunt *libri* (*ex* Sum *B*) PHIL. *om. libri*: *add. Seyffertus* (*Berl. Phil. Woch. t.* XVIII *p.* 814) michi *EJ* autumo *B*[3] *in ras.*: autumo (u *pri. ex corr.*) *V*: autumno *J* 237. PHIL. *praem. Schoellius* (*cf. v.* 236) tibi suadeo *Camerarius*: suadeam meo (suad- *ex* suam- *ut vid. corr. B*[3]) *B* petri *ut vid. B*[1] (*corr. B*[3]) 238. PHIL. *praem. Leo* (*cf. v.* 236) meum (u *ex corr.*) *B*

232. **Maxima pars...homines.** For the Apposition cf. *Men.* 858 *hunc senem Osse fini dedolabo assulatim uiscera*, Cas. 337 *Quis mihi subueniet tergo aut capiti aut cruribus?* Hallidie quotes Liv. XXVI. xxxiii. 14 *Quod senatus iuratus, maxima pars, censeat.*

233, 234. I discard the arrangement in the MSS. and make two short lines instead of one long, the first a Catalectic Iambic Dimeter, the second a Cretic Trimeter. The second might be scanned as an Iambic Dimeter acatalectic, though it is more likely that the change in sense (*Sed id* &c.) should coincide with the change in metre. Some substitute for *sese* the form *sesed* and retain the single line of the MSS., an Iambic Octonarius. *Sesed* occurs on an old inscription (*C.I.L.* xi. 3078), but is hardly Plautine.

236. Hermann's change of *Sunt* to *Fiunt* is generally accepted, though confusion of *S* and *F* is as uncommon as that of minuscule *s* and *f* is common. It is conceivable that Plautus might use *sunt ex* as well as *fio ex* (cf. *Merc.* 129 *ex hoc metu ut sim certus*, Epid. 644 *di me ex perdita seruatam cupiunt*). The first foot would then have to be *sunt nunc*, and the line Bacchiac catalectic or possibly 'contracted' Cretic (cf. v. 217). I follow Seyffert in making Philocrates' speech begin at *Nunc* rather than at *Quod* (v. 237) or *Pol* (v. 238). Tyndarus has already told Philocrates what he wishes from him.

237. **Quod tibi suadeam,** Subj. of Attraction. Cf. v. 961, *Curc.* 484, *Bacch.* 19[illegible], *Amph.* 871, *Most.* 1100 *quod agas, id agas.* We have similarly two Futures in *Trin.* 714, *Stich.* 86, *Rud.* 1136.

238. **Si te audeam.** With the position of *te* we may compare the position of *tibi* in *Most.* 293 *tibi me exorno ut placeam*, of *mihi* in *Poen.* [illegible] [illegible] *mihi patronus sim necessest*, of *me* in *Asin.* 493 *neque me*

Nam secundum patrem tu es pater proxumus.
TYND. Audio. PHIL. Et propterea saepius te uti memineris moneo:
Non ego erus tibi, sed seruos sum; nunc obsecro te hoc unum—
Quoniam nobis di inmortales animum ostenderunt suum,
Vt qui erum me tibi fuisse atque esse nunc conseruom uelint,
Quom antehac pro iure imperitabam meo, nunc te oro per precem—

---

239. proxumus *B*^{3}*VJ*: proximus *B*^{1}*D* (u *ex* ii *ut vid.*) *E* 240. PHIL. *om.* *D* et *in ras.* *B* sepius *libri* ted *Fleckeisenus* ut *libri*: *corr.* *Leo* 241. herus *V*^{2}*J* sed *om.* *D* seruum *D*: seruus *VE* sum *E ex corr.* 242. di inmortales *V*: diim mortales *ex* dum mortales *B*: di immortales *DE*: dii inmortales *J*^{1} (imm. *J*^{2}) ostenderunt (*ex* as- *ut vid.*) *D* 243. erum *ex* erunt *B*: herum *V*^{2}*J* nunc *del. Bothius* conseruom *J*: conseruum *ceteri* 244. Quom *Fleckeisenus*: Quod *libri*

Athenis alter est hodie quisquam quoi credi aeque putent, &c., &c. Brix compares *Pseud.* 120 *Si neminem alium potero* (sc. tangere), *tuom tangam patrem*, Asin. 248 *Si mutuas non potero* (sc. sumere), *certumst sumam fenore*. **Patrem.** See note on v. 444.

240. **Audio**, 'I am attending to you,' in this isolated position, whether at the beginning or at the end of the line, is not uncommon (*Curc.* 610, *Mil.* 218, 798, *Pseud.* 291). **Propterea** (referring to vv. 237—9) with Comparative, as in *Men.* 977, *Poen.* prol. 62, *Stich.* 180. The more usual Particle however is *eo*, e.g. *Aul.* 185. **Uti memineris moneo.** *Stich.* 42 *Quam ob rem ego te hoc, soror, tametsi es maior, Moneo, ut tuom memineris officium.* On *uti* see note on v. 115.

241. **Hoc unum.** See note on v. 747.

242. **Animum ostenderunt suum.** *Asin.* 112 *cum tu mihi tua Oratione omnem animum ostendisti tuom.*

243. **Vt qui** (see note on v. 553). **Fuisse**, 'have ceased to be,' like Virgil's *fuimus Troes.* Cf. vv. 516, 575, &c. **Esse nunc.** Most editors follow Bothe in regarding *nunc* as a gloss, whose intrusion spoils the metre.

244. *Quod*, the reading of the MSS., is changed by most editors to *quom*, though something might be said for retaining the traditional text. **Imperitabam** (see note on v. 83). *Pseud.* 703 *qui imperitas Pseudolo.* **Te oro.** This is the normal order, not 'oro te,' &c. (cf. vv. **337**, **515**, **942**).

Per fortunam incertam et per mei te erga bonitatem patris,
Perque conseruitium commune, quod hostica euenit manu,
Ne me secus honore honestes quam quom seruibas mihi,
Atque ut qui fueris et qui nunc sis meminisse ut memineris.

---

245. mei (*ex* maei) tae *B* 247. Neme *ras. ex* Naemae *B* honore (e *ras. ex* ae *ut vid.*) *B* honestes (n *ex* r) *B* cum *J* seruiebas *libri* (i *e corr. V*): *corr. Pylades*

---

246. **Perque** to be pronounced *perc* (cf. *nec* for *neque*, *ac* i.e. '*atc*' for *atque*; see Introd. ii. § 14). **Hostica** has here the sense of 'hostile,' but in *Mil.* 450 that of 'strange': *hosticum hoc mihi domicilium est; Athenis domus est.* The form was old-fashioned in the Augustan Age, as we see from Porphyrio's note on Horace *C.* II. i. 1: *adtende autem non 'civile' sed 'civicum' dixisse antiqua figura. Illi enim 'civica' et 'hostica,' deinde 'civilia' et 'hostilia' dicebant.* The first syllable of the word is not to be scanned short in this line. The fourth foot is a dactyl (*-mune quod*), as in v. 570 and elsewhere (see Introd. iii. § 17). Some editors transpose *quod commune* to avoid the irregular division of the dactyl (Introd. iii. § 16).

247. **Honore honestes**, a jingling phrase that occurs again in v. 356. (See note on v. 107 *moratus moribus*).

248. **Qui fueris.** Before consonants *qui*, not *quis*, is normally used in indirect questions in Plautus and Terence, e.g. *Mil.* 261 *qui fuerit conseruos* (AP), *Pseud.* 263 *scio qui fuit* (AP). (See note on v. 285.) **Vt... meminisse ut memineris** (see note on *sci scire*, v. 297). The repetition of *ut* (like that of ἂν in Greek) is not uncommon in colloquial Latin. *Cas.* 511 *Ibo intro ut id quod alius condiuit cocus, Ego nunc uicissim ut alio pacto condiam*; Pseud. 580—3 *ut, ubiquomque hostibus congrediar,...Facile ut uincam, facile ut spoliem meos perduellis meis perfidiis*; Rud. 1256 *At ego deos quaeso, ut quidquid in illo uidulost, Si aurum si argentum est, omne id ut fiat cinis*; Trin. 140—4 *Subigis maledictis me tuis, Megaronides, Nouo modo adeo, ut quod meae concreditumst Taciturnitati clam...Ut mihi necesse sit iam id tibi concredere*; Ter. *Phorm.* 153 *Adeon rem redisse, ut qui mi consultum optume uelit esse, Phaedria, patrem ut extimescam*; Andr. 828 *perpulisti me, ut homini adulescentulo In alio occupato amore, abhorrenti ab re uxoria, Filiam ut darem.*

TYNDAR. Scio equidem me te esse nunc et te esse me. PHIL. Em istuc si potes
Memoriter meminisse, inest spes nobis in hac astutia.

HEGIO senex. PHILOCRATES, TYNDARVS eidem. II. ii.

HEG. Iam ego reuortar intro, si ex his quae uolo exquisiuero.—
Vbi sunt isti quos ante aedis iussi huc produci foras?

---

249. TYND. *om.* *D* Scio (o *e corr.*) *B* quidem *libri*: *corr. Luchsius* (*Herm.* vi. 277) *pro* PHIL. *spat.* *D* hem *J* potest *B* 250. menisse *J* II. ii. SENEX HEGIO PHILOCR. EIDEM TYNDARVS *BVE*: *unius v. spat.* *D*: EGIO SENEX PHILOCRATES ET IDEM TINDARVS *J* 251. HEG. *om.* *D* (*J n. l.*) am *cum sp. init.* *D*: iam *cum sp. init.* V^1 (i *exp. et* i *in marg. adscr.* V^2) ego *ex* ergo *ut vid.* *J* ego reuertar intro B^3 *in spat.* reuortar *J*: reuertar *ceteri* que *BDJ* 252. aedis *V*: edis *BDE*: aedes *J* Foras *proximo versui adplicant libri* (*post* PHIL.)

---

249. **Scio equidem,** not '*scio quidem*,' is the Plautine phrase (e.g. *Trin.* 353, 698), so that we must suppose the *quidem* of the MSS. in this line to be a corruption of *equidem*. (Cf. note on *nam equidem*, v. 394.)

250. **Memoriter meminisse,** a favourite jingle. Cf. *Poen.* 562 *meministis memoriter*, Amph. 417 *memorat memoriter*, Afranius *Com.* 365 R. *memini memoriter*, Pomponius *Com.* 109 R. *memore meministi*.

Act II. Scene ii. (Trochaic Septenarii). Hegio comes out of the house and questions Philocrates, the supposed slave, about his master, then broaches to Tyndarus the proposal for an exchange of prisoners. Tyndarus persuades him to send Philocrates to negotiate the exchange. In this scene Hegio confirms the good impression he left in Act I. Sc. ii. of his kindly disposition, and the audience must endorse Tyndarus' description of his father as *optimus hominum homo* (v. 333). The assumption by Tyndarus of the character of master, and by Philocrates of slave, gives scope for clever acting, especially in the part of Tyndarus, the leading part in the piece, with the change from his natural tone in the passages uttered 'aside' to the audience to the assumed tone in which he addresses Hegio. Nor does the dramatist neglect the opportunity of indicating the irony of the situation in the dialogue between Hegio and his unrecognized son.

251. Spoken by Hegio to some one in the house. His promise is not kept, for his conversation with the Captives makes him change his intention (vv. 449—450, 460). **His,** 'the prisoners here' (note on v. 38). Hegio knows that they must be in his vicinity, though he does not yet see them.

252. **Vbi sunt isti?** 'where are the prisoners in your charge?' The

[redacted]

PHIL. Edepol tibi ne in quaestione essemus cautum intellego,
Ita uinclis custodiisque circum moeniti sumus.

---

253. PHIL. *om. D, ut semper inde ab hac scaena in principiis versuum, cum in mediis spatia reliquerit* in *om.* B^1DVEJ: *add.* B^3 questione *libri* (-nem *E*) HE. cautum B^3 *in ras.* (HE. *in 5 litt. ras. ut vid.*): chautum (u *alt. e corr.*) *D*: chautum *VE*: cautum *J* intelligo *J* 254. PH. *praem.* B^3 uinculis *B* moenitis *EV* (n *ex* u)

---

question is addressed to the guards, who, at the orders given by the *lorarius* just before his departure (vv. 213, 215), had retired to a distance from the Captives. **Quos ante aedis iussi huc produci foras.** On these words has been based the theory that the Captives after the Prologue were not seen on the stage until Act II. Sc. i. It is surely much more natural to suppose the Captives to have remained on the stage from the beginning of the play; and there are many indications that this was actually the case (see notes on vv. 98, I. ii. init., 110, 125, 169, II. i. init.). Hegio's remark here need not refer to some order subsequent to that given in vv. 114—5. He may be speaking merely of the instructions which are supposed to have been issued prior to the play, and in compliance with which the Captives appear on the stage during the Prologue.

253. **In quaestione essemus,** 'should be to seek,' a common phrase. Similar is *in expectatione esse alicui* (*Mil.* 1279). **Cautum intellego.** These words are assigned to Hegio by a correction (B^3) in the Codex Vetus, so that the passage would read:

> PHIL. Edepol tibi ne in quaestione essemus— HEG. Cautum intellego.
> PHIL. Ita uinclis, &c.,

with the same interruption of a speaker's remarks as occurs elsewhere in Plautus (cf. v. 337). These corrections, which I believe to have been taken from the Archetype (*P*) from which the immediate original (P^{BD}) of our MSS. was copied (see Introd. i. § 9), are generally to be followed. But not, I think, in this instance. The breaking up of the line seems pointless. If we take into consideration the curious misspelling in the MSS. *chautum* (but *cautum* B^3), it looks as though in the Archetype the 'overflow' words of the line *cautum intellego* had been written in some available space with the customary symbol, a suprascript *H.* or *H.S.* ('hoc supplendum'), to indicate the transposition. I fancy that *H.* *cautum intellego* of the Archetype (*P*) became *chautum intellego* in P^{BD}, but was understood by the corrector (B^3) as HEG. *cautum intellego.* (Cf. critical note on v. 393.)

254. **Vinclis** (see note on v. 204). **Moeniti.** The older spelling

HEG. Qui cauet ne decipiatur, uix cauet, cum etiam cauet;
Etiam cum cauisse ratus est, saepe is cautor captus est.
An uero non iusta causa est, ut uos seruem sedulo,
Quos tam grandi sim mercatus praesenti pecunia?
PHIL. Neque pol tibi nos, quia nos seruas, aequomst uitio uortere,

---

255. me *J* 256. etiam *cum spat. init. BD* ratus *ex* raptus *V* sepe *libri* captus *ex* cautus *V* 257. seruem B^3V^2J: seruet B^1DV^1E 258. grandis sim mercatus B^1 (*corr. ras.*): grandis inmercatus V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* presenti *BD*: presenti *ex* presentia *V*: praesentia *E*: presentia *J* 259. aequom est uitio *Camerarius*: eqũo stulcio B^1 (*corr.* stulte B^3): equom stulcio *D*: equom stultio V^1 (*corr.* ecum V^2) *EJ* uertere *VEJ*

---

with *oe* has been retained in all our MSS. in this line, though a scribe's usual tendency was to 'modernize' *oe* to *u*, or, if he did not recognize the word, to write *o* for *oe*. In *Truc.* 102 our best minuscule MS. has preserved the spelling *oenus* for *unus*.

255. Publil. Syrus 116 R. *Caret periclo qui etiam cum est tutus cavet.* **Cum.** The passage from the sense of 'when' to the sense of 'although' is illustrated by this line. Cf. *Bacch.* 1005 *Sat sic suspectus sum, cum careo noxia*, Aul. 113 *Nam nunc cum celo sedulo omnis, ne sciant, Omnes uidentur scire.*

256. **Cauisse ratus est.** See note on v. 365. **Cautor captus est**, a proverb (*Epid.* 359 *iam ipse cautor captus est*), probably of legal origin (*caveo*, to give security). Cf. Cic. *Fam.* VII. vi. 2 (to Trebatius) *tu qui ceteris cavere didicisti, in Britannia ne ab essedariis decipiaris caveto*, Ovid *A. A.* I. 83 *Illo saepe loco capitur consultus Amori, Quique aliis cavit non cavet ipse sibi.* The repetition 'ad nauseam' of *caveo* is quite in the manner of the Early Latin Poetry. Cf. Ennius *Sat.* inc. 84 sqq. M.:

Nam qui lepide postulat alterum frustrari,
Quem frustratur frustra eum dicit esse frustra.
Nam qui se frustrari*er* quem*que* frustra sentit,
Qui frustratur, frustra *is* est, si ille non est frustra.

257. **An uero non iusta causa est** recurs in *Poen.* 533 *Án uero non iústa causa est, quor curratur celeriter, Ubi bibas, edas de alieno quantum uelis usque ad fatim?* **Vt**, for *cur*, after *causa*. Cf. Liv. V. 55. 5 *Ea est causa, ut veteres cloacae, primo per publicum ductae, nunc privata passim subeant tecta.*

258. Hegio had just come from a perusal of his bank-book (vv. 192 sq.).

259. **Quia** (see note on v. 153). **Vitio uortere** is as common a

Neque te nobis, si abeamus hinc, si fuat occasio.
HEG. Vt uos hic, itidem illi[c] apud uos meus seruatur filius.
PHIL. Captus est? HEG. Ita. PHIL. Non igitur nos soli ignaui fuimus.
HEG. Secede huc; nam sunt ex te quae solo scitari uolo;

---

260. PHIL. *praem. del. rubr. E* habeamus *VE* **261.** uos (u *ex* n *rubr.*) *E* *ante* illic (B^2 *ut vid.*) 2—3 *litt. ras. B* aput *BJ* me *D* **262.** PHI (I *ex* E *ras.*) *B* ignari B^1DVE: igitari *J*: ingnaui B^2 *ut vid.* **263.** HEG. *om. VE* (*J n. l.*) huc <tu> *Schoellius* nam *ex* nos *E* quae ex te *libri*: *corr. Camerarius* solio *J* stitari DV^1E: citari *ut vid.* V^2

---

phrase in Plautus as in classical literature, e.g. *Mil.* 1350 *ne quis tibi hoc uitio uortat*, Epid. 108, *Rud.* 700, &c.

260. **Si abeamus hinc,** 'if we *should* happen to go off.' *Si* (unelided) has the metrical ictus here, as it probably had the stress in the pronunciation of this sentence. Cf. Donatus' note (ad Ter. *Eun.* III. i. 47=437) on the different sense conveyed by the accentuations *síquando* and *siquándo*. **Fuat** (see note on v. 431).

261. **Illi.** Since the normal metrical accentuation of the phrase is *apúd uos* (Introd. ii. § 19), it is probable that the O. Lat. Adv. *illi* has in this line suffered the usual change at the hands of scribes to *illic* (see note on v. 94 and cf. *Stich.* 471 where *illi apud te* has been altered in the Ambrosian Palimpsest to *illic apud te*).

262. **Captus est?**, 'he is a prisoner?' (see note on v. 611). **Ita,** 'yes,' frequent in the Dramatists. As an answer to a preceding question we find only *ita*, but as a confirmation of a preceding assertion both *ita* and *ita est*, e.g. *Rud.* 152 A. *Confracta nauis in marist illis.* B. *Itast.* **Nos soli** is the normal order; so Fleckeisen's proposal *soli nos* should be rejected. Brix favours *non nos igitur* on the ground of the Alliteration (cf. ad v. 327). **Fuimus,** with *ŭ* (see note on v. 555).

263. The simplest remedy of the metre is the transposition of *quae ex te* of the MSS. Schoell inserts *tu* after *huc*, Fleckeisen *ego* before *ex*, both being words which might have been omitted by Haplography. Brix adopts Fleckeisen's suggestion, on the ground of the frequency of *ego* in this formula, e.g. vv. 295, 951, *Asin.* 47 *Cur hoc ego ex te quaeram?* &c. **Volo.** In Plautus the Ind. is found in the phrase *sunt quae uolo* or *est quod uolo*, e.g. *Cas.* 689 *est quod uolo exquirere ex te*, Pseud. 462 *sunt quae te uolumus percontari.* Cf. Cic. *Att.* x. 4. 11 *sunt autem quae praeterii*, Corn. Nep. iv. 4. 2 *erant in eadem epistula, quae ad ea pertinebant* (cf. ad v. 327).

Quarum rerum te falsilocum mihi esse nolo. PHIL. Non ero
Quod sciam : si quid nesciui, id nescium tradam tibi.
TYND. Nunc senex est in tostrina ; nunc iam cultros adtinet.

264. rerum te *ex* te rerum *E* falsiloqum (*ex* -cum) *B* : falsu (*ex* -sum) locum *E* michi *J* uolo V^1 (*corr.* V^2) 265. si quod *VE* : id quod *J* siquid nescibo *Acidalius Divin. p.* 94: quod nesciumst *Havetus* 266. TYND. *Saracenus*: *om. BD*: HEG. *VEJ* in tostrina B^2V^2: bitostrina B^1 *ut vid.* (hi-?) *D* (ri *e corr. et* to *s.v.*) V^1E: in tonstrina *J* attinet *VJ*

264. **Quarum rerum...falsilocum.** A similar Genitive of Respect occurs e.g. *Amph.* prol. 105, where Mercury is talking of Jupiter's amours, *Quam liber harum rerum multarum siet*; Ter. *Adel.* 695 *Nolim ceterarum rerum te socordem eodem modo.* **Mihi** should perhaps be *mi* (cf. ad v. 150).

265. **Quod.** See note on v. 216. **Nesciui** for *nescio* may perhaps stand with the help of *Poen.* 629 *Ego male loquendi uobis nesciui uiam.* At the same time *nescibo*, if written *nesciuo* in some Archetype, would readily become *nesciui* in our MSS. The Fut. appears in *Pseud.* 480 *siquid uis, roga. Quod scibo, Delphis tibi responsum dicito.* **Nescium**, with passive sense. The Adj. is used only in one other passage of Plautus, *Rud.* 275 *Quae in locis nesciis nescia spe sumus*, where *nesciis* is passive, *nescia* (as in class. Latin) active (cf. Gell. *N. A.* IX. xii. 21 *nescius quoque dicitur tam is qui nescitur quam qui nescit*). For the active sense, 'not knowing,' Plautus and Terence use *insciens* (e.g. v. 45), classical writers *inscius*. Cf. Turpilius *Com.* 65 R. *At enim scies ea quae fuisti inscius* (*nescius* edd.). **Id nescium tradam tibi.** *Curc.* 385 *Ego hoc effectum lepide tibi tradam* (cf. ad v. 345).

266. The metaphor implied in the colloquial use of *tondere* for 'to cheat' seems to be here referred to the helpless state of a man in the hands of a barber. Elsewhere the victim's loss of his money is compared to a sheep's loss of its fleece, so that *tondere* would correspond exactly to our term 'to fleece.' Thus in the *Bacchides*, where the white-haired old men are playfully likened to a couple of strayed sheep (vv. 1121 sqq.), the cunning slave announces his scheme to the audience in these words (v. 241):

Adibo hunc, quem quidem ego hodie faciam hic arietem
Phrixi, itaque tondebo auro usque ad uiuam cutem.

Cf. *Merc.* 524 *Ouem tibi eccillam dabo, natam annos sexaginta....tondetur nimium scite.* **Tostrina.** The old spelling (cf. *mostellum*, a hobgoblin, *Mostellaria*, sc. *fabula*, 'the play about the hobgoblin,' "the Haunted House," from *monstrum*) is here retained in the MSS., whose reading *bi*

Ne id quidem, inuolucre inicere, uoluit, uestem ut ne inquinet.

---

267. ne *s.v.* *B* ne inquinet *ex* nemqu- *D*

(or *hi*) for *in* is to be explained by the use of the tall form of the letter for initial *i*. We have the spelling *praemostro* preserved in *Trin.* 342, *commostro* Poen. 602, 1043, &c. And *-ust* is often written for *-umst* in our MSS. of Plautus (e.g. *Curc.* 263, 411) and Terence (e.g. *Eun.* 612, 959, *Hec.* 457), just as it is found on some inscriptions, e.g. *quod scriptust legas* (Bücheler *Carm. Epigr.* 848), *hospes resiste et nisi molestust perlege* (Büch. 118). **Nunc iam**, two separate monosyllabic words, to be distinguished from the single trisyllabic *nunciam* (cf. *etiam*, *quoniam*) which is found only in commands or with a Future Tense (see note on v. 772). *Nunc iam* recurs in *Epid.* 135 *Illam amabam olim: nunc iam alia cura impendet pectori*, but is more often found with intervening words, e.g. *Stich.* 762 *Dudum placuit potio, nunc minus grauate iam accipit*, *Rud.* 137 *semper petunt...Nunc interuallum iam hos dies multos fuit*, where the separate force of the two Adverbs is clearly exhibited, 'at present (*nunc*), for more than one day, now or already (*iam*)' (cf. *Stich.* 188, *Bacch.* 1075, *Truc.* 603). Translate, 'see now, he is already holding the scissors at his head.' A third phrase is *iam nunc*, e.g. *Curc.* 216 *Migrare certumst iam nunc e fano foras*, 'now, without waiting for a future occasion' (cf. *Men.* prol. 47, *Poen.* 614, *Asin.* 496). **Adtinet** has its literal sense 'holds at,' 'holds near,' as in *Men.* 730 *Nunc eandem* (*pallam*) *ante oculos attines*. The intransitive use (cf. *pertineo*) is also common in Plautus, e.g. *Poen.* 1307 *nihil ad te attinet*, who has also an intransitive *transtineo* (*Mil.* 468 *commeatus transtinet trans parietem*), and *contineo* (*Stich.* 452 *per hortum utroque commeatus continet*). Change of Subject, *senex est...adtinet* (sc. Philocrates), is common enough in the colloquial diction of Plautus, e.g. *Trin.* 1049:

> Male fidem seruando illis quoque abrogant etiam fidem,
> Qui nil meriti; quippe eorum ex ingenio ingenium horum probant.

Cf. *Men.* 454, *Trin.* 597, 813.

267. **Ne id quidem**, with following clause in Apposition, as in *Asin.* 149 *At scelesta uiden ut ne id quidem, me dignum esse existumat Quem adeat, quem conloquatur, quoique irato supplicet?* (cf. ad 969 below). Cf. *Poen.* 840 *Nam id quidem, illi, ut meditatur, uerba facit emortuo*, Bacch. 1115:

> *A.* Quid tibi ex filio nam, obsecro, aegrest? *B.* Scies:
> Id, perit cum tuo: ambo aeque amicas habent.

Inuolucre need not be changed to *inuolucrum*.

Sed utrum strictimne adtonsurum dicam esse an per pectinem,
Nescio; uerum, si frugist, usque admutilabit probe.
HEG. Quid tu? seruosne esse an liber mauelis, memora mihi.
PHIL. Proxumum quod sit bono quodque a malo longissime,

---

268. strictumne V^1 (*corr.* V^2) adtonsurum (*ex* -am) *D*: attonsurum *J* petinem *B ante corr.* *D* (p *ex* t) *VE* 269. *uersum laudat Osbernus p.* 341 'si frugi est usque admutilabit probe' PHIL. *praem. libri*: *del. Saracenus* frugi est V^2J admutilalabit *libri* (admutalabit *D*, admutilabit *J*) prope B^1: probae *V* 270. seruosne *J*: seruusne *ceteri* michi *J* 271. PHIL. *add.* B^2: *om. cett.* Proxumum (x *s.v.*) *B*: Proximum *VEJ* bonum *VEJ*

---

268. **Utrum...ne** is common in Plautus, e.g. *Most.* 681 *Videndumst primum utrum eae uelintne an non uelint.* The particle *ne* is appended to the first of the two contrasted words, not to *utrum*, which stands in Apposition to the following clause (cf. v. 267). **Adtonsurum dicam esse**, a periphrasis for *adtonsurus sit* that is quite in the Plautine manner (see note on v. 533).

269. **Usque admutilabit**, 'will crop thoroughly.' *Mil.* 768 *sycophantiam, Qui admutiletur miles usque caesariatus*, Pers. 829 *qui me usque admutilauisti ad cutem.* Cf. *Bacch.* 1095 *Is me scelus auro usque attondit*; *Bacch.* 242 *tondebo auro usque ad uiuam cutem.* The Adj. *mutilus* was appropriate to animals whose horns had been removed; cf. Hor. *S.* I. v. 60 *Sic mutilus minitaris?*, 'with your horns gone.' **Probe** has its common colloquial sense, as in *Bacch.* 701 *emungam hominem probe.*

270. **Quid tu?** *Pseud.* 610 *Quid tu? seruosne es an liber?* So *quid ipsus hic?* 279, and frequently *quid is?*, &c., followed by a question which is introduced by the Interrogative Particle *-ne* (see note on v. 717). **Mauelis**, 'would you prefer,' potential. In Plautus *velis* and *vis* are used at will, without any noticeable difference of meaning. (On the form see Introd. ii. § 9.) **Memora mihi.** See note on v. 983.

271. *Proximus* takes usually the Dat. in Plautus (e.g. *Aul.* 129 *Tibi proximam me mihique esse item te*, Mil. 348 *hic eae proxumust*), but the Acc. in *Poen.* 1120 *qui te proximust.* There is therefore a possibility that the reading of inferior MSS. *bonum* has not been changed from *bono* under the mistaken idea that the phrase used was *proxumum bonum*, 'the nearest good,' but that on the contrary the better MSS. have altered *bonum*, the reading of their original, through ignorance of the construction of *proximus* with the Acc. (see note on v. 176). There is no need of supposing *proxumum* here to be the Adverb (normally *proxume*), for the conjunction of

Id uolo: quamquam non multum fuit molesta seruitus,
Nec mihi secus erat quam si essem familiaris filius.
TYND. Eugepae! Thalem talento non emam Milesium,
Nam ad sapientiam huius <hominis> nimius nugator fuit.
Ut facete orationem ad seruitutem contulit!

---

272. PHIL. *praem. libri*; *corr. B*[3] molestia *E* 273. esse *J* 274. TYND. *B*[3]: HEG. *cett.* Eugepae Thalem *Gulielmius Qu. in Capt. p.* 356: Euge petalem *BD*: Euge potalem *V*[1]*E*: Euge optalem *V*[2]: Euge potalem (*suprascr. man.* 1 vel ob) *J* tanlento *BD* 275. huius *ex* huis *E* <hominis> *Niemeyerus*: <nimiam> nimius *Schoellius* 276. uocete *D*: facere *J* seruitutēm (*sic*) *B*: seruiturem *E*

Adj. (*proxumum*) and Adv. (*longissime*) is quite in the Plautine manner. See note on v. 960 *Recte et uera loquere.* **Sit...longissime.** The use of an Adverb with *esse* is a common feature of colloquial Latin. But *longe esse* for *longe abesse* is not unknown in literary Latin too. It occurs again in *Bacch.* 595, *Pers.* 151 (cf. *Men.* 64).

272. **Quamquam** (see note on v. 298). **Multum molesta.** *Multum* often qualifies Adjectives (never Adverbs) in Plautus, but not in Terence. Cf. v. 87 *multum incommodestici.* It also qualifies Verbs, e.g. *salve multum, multum vale,* &c. We find some instances of *multum* with Adjectives in the *Satires* and *Epistles* of Horace, e.g. *Epp.* I. x. 3 *multum dissimiles* (cf. *C.* I. xxv. 5); and even in Cicero we get *multum dispares* (*Off.* I. 30. 109). The usage is confined to archaic or colloquial literature. From Vulg. Lat. *multum* comes Ital. 'molto' in 'molto bene,' &c.

273. **Familiaris filius,** the usual expression in the Dramatists (cf. *Asin.* 267, 309, *Com. frag.* inc. 97 R.). Either the phrase *filius familias* had not established itself in common parlance so firmly as *mater familias* (freq. in Plautus, &c.) or it was not so suitable for the metre.

274. **Non emam,** or *non empsim,* a formula of depreciation: *non emam* Poen. 274; *non empsim* Cas. 347; *Mil.* 316 *non ego tuam empsim uitam uitiosa nuce.* **Thalem,** the type of wisdom. *Bacch.* 122 *O Lyde, es barbarus, Quem ego sapere nimio censui plus quam Thalem,* Rud. 1003 A. *Stultus es.* B. *Salue, Thales.* **Talento.** This is the sum mentioned in Alexis *Com.* fr. 36 K. Τούτῳ τάλαντον δοὺς μαθητὴς γίνεται Ὁ δεσπότης.

275. **Ad,** 'in comparison with,' as in *Mil.* 968 *Ad tuam formam illa una dignast,* Ter. *Eun.* 361 *at nihil ad nostram hanc,* Cic. *de Orat.* II. vi. 25 *nihil ad Persium.* The defect in the metre of the line is variously supplied: *huius* <*hominis*> (cf. ad prol. v. 10) or <*nimiam*> *nimius.*

276. **Contulit,** 'adapted.' *Curc.* 28 *Ita tuom conferto amare semper, si sapis, Ne id quod ames populus si sciat, tibi sit probro.* Whether the

HEG. Quo de genere natust illic Philocrates? PHIL. Polyplusio:
Quod genus illi est unum pollens atque honoratissumum.
HEG. Quid ipsus hic? Quo honore est illic? PHIL. Summo, atque ab summis uiris.

---

277. HEG. *add.* B^2: *om. cett.* de (d *e corr. et cum ras.*) *B* natus est V^2J illi *Fleckeisenus* philocrathes *BD* poliplusio *DE*: polypiusio *V*: Polyphrusio *J* 278. illic *libri*: *corr. Bothius* unum est *Pylades* 279. Quod *VEJ* honore *ex* honere *D* atque atque *D* absumis *EJ ut vid.*

---

word has this sense in the phrase in *Mil.* 781 *uerba ad compendium conferre*, 'to study brevity,' is doubtful; for there is a similar phrase *pauca in uerba conferre* (*Pers.* 661 &c.), in which *confero* has clearly the sense of 'put together,' 'pack' (cf. *ponito ad compendium* Cas. 517). It has a different sense in Ter. *Eun.* 740 sq.:

> Usque adeo ego illius ferre possum ineptiam et magnifica uerba,
> Verba dum sint; uerum enim si ad rem conferentur, uapulabit.

Ad often expresses 'after the likeness of,' 'in the manner of,' e.g. *Trin.* 873 *ad istanc capitis albitudinem* (cf. *ad istam faciem*).

277. **Quo de genere,** normally *quo genere* in this phrase, e.g. v. 295. Cf. *summo genere gnatus* v. 319, *Poen.* 1240. **Natust** (see note on v. 295). A line preserved from the Θηβαῖοι of Alexis is of similar purport to this line. But the resemblance may be accidental.

278. **Quod genus.** On the repetition of the Noun in the Relative Clause see note on v. 1. The simplest remedy for the line is the restoration of the old form *illi* Adv. Whether *illi* has been similarly changed to *illic* in vv. 277, 279, is impossible to say (see note on v. 94). **Unum** with Superlative, a common usage, e.g. *Amph.* 677 *Quam omnium Thebis uir unam esse optimam diiudicat.* So on a Scipio epitaph *honc oinom ploirume cosentiont Romai Duonoro optumo fuisse uiro*, i.e. 'hunc unum plurimi consentiunt Romae bonorum optimum fuisse uirum.' Its combination with *pollens*, a Positive, is unusual. But *pollens* has of itself a quasi-Superlative force. Cf. Cic. *Orat.* 29. 104 *Demosthenes unus eminet inter omnes oratores.*

279. **Ab summis uiris.** The idea is the same as in Naevius' famous phrase *laudari a laudato uiro.* For *ab*, 'proceeding from,' 'given by,' cf. *Trin.* 637 *beneficium a beneuolente*, Truc. 876 *a milite omnis mihi spes.* Or perhaps *summo honore* suggests *summopere honoratus.* Brix translates, 'he belongs to the highest circles'; and Morris compares *Mil.* 160 *quemque a milite*, 'anyone from the soldier's house.'

[redacted]

HEG. Tum igitur ei cum in Aleis *tam* gratia est, ut praedicas,
Quid diuitiae? Suntne opimae? PHIL. Unde excoquat sebum senex.
HEG. Quid pater? Viuitne? PHIL. Viuum, cum inde abimus, liquimus;
Nunc uiuat<ne> necne, id Orcum scire oportet scilicet.

---

280. *versum del. Ussingius* tam *Niemeyerus*: tanta *libri* gracia *J* predicas *BV* 281. Quod V^1 (*corr.* V^2) diuiciae *BJ* opimae *Camerarius in annot.*: optume *libri* (-mae *J*) exquoquat *B* seuum *libri*: *corr. Lambinus* 282. Quod *VJ ut vid.* uiuum *ex* uiuit- *ut vid. D* abiimus *libri*: *corr. Bothius cum Italis* linquimus B^1 (*corr.* B^3) 283. uiuat necne *libri*: *corr. Bothius* ortum *J*

---

280. The line cannot remain as the MSS. present it, for *Aleis* as a third foot is impossible. Schoell's double transposition *tanta ei in Aleis cum gratia* deals too violently with the reading of the MSS., and more legitimate transpositions like *tanta gratia ei cum in Aleis* or, simpler still, *ei cum tanta in Aleis gratia*, produce doubtful rhythm. To suppose with Brix that *Aleis*, a rare example of the correct form (see note on v. 9), can have come into the text as a gloss or as a corruption of *illis* is quite unreasonable. The explanation that *tam*, which seems to be capable of being used by Plautus with a Noun (e.g. *Pers.* 533), has been ousted by the gloss or grammatical correction *tanta*, is the best that has yet been offered, though it is open to the objection that *tam gratia est* in Plautus means 'no thank you!'

281. **Opimae.** The word is used as a synonym of *adipatus* by Cicero *Orat.* 8. 25 *opimum quoddam et tanquam adipatae dictionis genus.* We cannot but acquiesce in Camerarius' correction of *optume* (*-ae*) to *opimae.* The old spelling *optumae* (with *u*) offers a difficulty, seeing that the habit of mediaeval scribes was rather to modernize the archaic spellings that they found in their original. We should expect to find *optime* (*-ae*) in our MSS. (cf. critical note on v. 769). I suppose that the neighbouring Superlative with the older spelling (*honoratissumum* v. 278) suggested the older form, unless it is due to the similarity of *im* and *um* in minuscule (and other) script. **Unde excoquat sebum senex** seems rather a poor joke. It may be some proverb, the exact sense of which is now lost to us.

282. **Quid pater? Viuitne?** (see note on v. 717). **Abimus** is probably Present, as in *Amph.* 668 *Grauidam ego illanc hic reliqui quom abeo* (see note on v. 887).

283. The Verb is often repeated with *necne*, e.g. *Epid.* 322 *sitne quid necne sit, Scire cupio*, but *Bacch.* 400 *sisne necne ut esse oportet.* **Scilicet**

TYND. Salua res est: philosophatur quoque iam, non mendax modo est.

HEG. Quid erat ei nomen? PHIL. Thensaurochrysonicochrysides.

HEG. Videlicet propter diuitias inditum id nomen quasi est.

PHIL. Immo edepol propter auaritiam ipsius atque audaciam.—

---

284. TYND. B^3: HEG. *cett.* modo est *ex* est modo *E* 285. HEG. B^3: *om. cett.* Quod *libri*: *corr. Brixius* nomen *ex* nomem *B* thensaurochrysonicochris (*ex* chrid) ides *B*: thensaurochrisonicochrisides *D*: thensaurochrysonico chy (chry V^2) sides *V*: tensaurochrusonicocrisides *E*: thensauro (*ex* thes-) crysonico (*ex* -icco *ut vid.*) crisides *J* 286. HEG. B^3: *om. ceteri* nomem *B*: (nome)m *incohatum V* 287. PHIL. B^3: *om. ceteri* auariciam *BDJ* atque *om. J* audatiam *BVE*

---

also takes Acc. and Inf., as if *scire licet* (cf. notes on vv. 90, 286), e.g. *Pseud.* 1179 *Scilicet solitum esse.*

284. *Pseud.* 974 *Saluos sum: iam philosophatur*, the words of a confederate in a plot, as here.

285. **Quid.** The distinction between *qui* and *quis* is not so sharply drawn in Plautus as in classical Latin. (For statistics see Seyffert in *Berliner Philolog. Wochenschrift*, 1893, p. 277.) Still the phrase *quid est* (*erat*) *tibi* (*ei*) *nomen?* seems fairly well established for Plautus, so that we may venture to alter *quod* of the MSS. (see note on v. 983). **Thensaurochrysonicochrysides.** The Nom. as well as the Dat. is found in answers to the question *Quid est nomen tibi?* &c., e.g. *Pseud.* 653 A. *Sed quid est tibi nomen?* B. *Harpax*, Cist. 772 A. *Sed quid est nomen tuae Dominae?* B. *Melaenis*, Men. 1131 A. *Quid erat nomen nostrae matri?* B. *Teuximarchae.* The old spelling *thensaurus* for θησαυρός resembles *Chersonensus* for Χερσόνησος, *Scaptensula* for Σκαπτησύλη (Σκαπτὴ ὕλη).

286. **Videlicet**, like *scilicet* (see note on v. 283), also takes Acc. and Inf., e.g. *Asin.* 599 *nunc enim esse Negotiosum interdius uidelicet Solonem.* **Quasi.** The order of the words is abnormal; cf. note on v. 157.

287. **Ipsius.** This is, curiously enough, the only example of the Gen. Sing. of *ipse* in Plautus. **Audaciam** has its ordinary sense of 'unprincipled daring,' 'effrontery.' *Audax* is often joined with *malus*, e.g. *Bacch.* 949:

> Nam illi itidem Ulixem audiui, ut ego sum, fuisse et audacem et malum:
> Dolis ego prensus sum, ille mendicans paene inuentus interit.

[redacted]

Nam illic quidem Theodoromedes fuit germano nomine.—
HEG. Quid tu ais? Tenaxne pater est eius? PHIL. Immo edepol pertenax;
Quin etiam ut magis noscas: genio suo ubi quando sacruficat,

---

288. illi *VEJ* theodor*medes *E* 289. eius est *J* pertinax *libri*: *correxi* 290. genio *ex* ingenio *D*

The word here refers to the third member of the compound name, viz. *thensaurochrysonico-*, '*conqueror* of treasures of gold,' and should not be explained as the equivalent of *avaritia* on the strength of Paul. Fest. 15. 20 Th. *Audacia ab avide, id est cupide, agendo est dicta.* Paulus is rather accounting for the etymology from *avidus* than communicating from early literature an obsolete sense of the Noun.

288. Hegio does not know the real name till v. 635, so that this remark of Philocrates must be an 'aside' to the audience, uttered, we may suppose, while Hegio, reflecting on this new piece of information, takes a step away from him. We have no reason to suppose that stage-directions like our '*aside*' were entered in ancient editions of Plautus. The few traces that we find in our MSS., e.g. *Aul.* 60 "*hoc secum loquitur,*" may have been added in mediaeval times. **Illic** (Adv.) **quidem** can hardly be a scribe's corruption of *ille quidem* (the reading substituted by Luchs), for a scribe would not change a familiar to an unfamiliar form, though it may be of *illi* (Adv.) *quidem* (cf. ad v. 60). *Illic quidem* seems not to occur in Plautus, but only *ille quidem* (e.g. v. 573).

289. **Quid tu ais?** (referring to v. 287). See note on v. 990. **Pertenax.** Compounds with *per* in its intensive sense were 'Separable' Compounds (cf. *per pol saepe peccas* Cas. 370); and the vowel of the simple stem did not suffer weakening, so that *pertenax* is a preferable spelling to *pertinax*. Lucilius twitted Scipio Africanus Minor with his affected use of *pertisus* instead of *pertaesus* (inc. 169 M.):

> Quo facetior uideare, et scire plus quam ceteri,
> 'Pertisum' hominem, non pertaesum, dices.

Pertaesum is the spelling on the Lyons tablet of the Emperor Claudius, a purist in these matters.

290. **Ut magis.** See note on *ut facilius* v. 33. **Ubi quando.** *Quando* seems here to be indefinite, 'at any time,' as in *siquando* (e.g. Cato *R. R.* 151. 4, 157. 10). Cf. *Stich.* 201 *Ei quando quem auctionem facturum sciunt, Adeunt, perquirunt quid siet causae ilico.*

Ad rem diuinam quibus est opus, Samiis uasis utitur,
Ne ipse Genius surripiat: proinde aliis ut credat uide.
HEG. Sequere hac me igitur: eadem ego ex hoc quae uolo exquaesiuero.

---

291. samus *V* utimur *VE* 292. aliis *B²E*: alius *cett.* et *VJ*: ut *om. E* 293. HEG. *om. E* exquesiuero *BD e corr. E*: exquisiuero *D ante corr. J*

---

291. **Rem diuinam** is here of four syllables, but trisyllabic in *Epid.* 316 <*Ut*> *dum rem dinam faceret, cantaret sibi.* Except in this phrase *diuinus* normally precedes its Noun in Plautus. **Est opus.** For the Dactyl in the fourth foot see Introd. iii. § 17. Brix follows the Renaissance MSS. in reading *opus est.* **Samiis uasis.** *Bacch.* 200 *Scis tu ut confringi uas cito Samium solet*; cf. *Men.* 179, *Stich.* 693:

quibus diuitiae domi sunt, scaphio et cantharis
Batiocis uiuunt, at nos nostro Samiolo poterio.

Cicero *Mur.* 75 mentions as a proof of Tubero's shabbiness: *exposuit vasa Samia.* For the arrangement of the clauses cf. *Truc.* 150 *qui arari solent ad pueros ire meliust*, Curc. 550 *tuom qui signum ad me attulisset, nuntium ne spernerem*, Pseud. 108 *Utinam quae dicis dictis facta suppetant*, &c.

292. **Surripiat.** See note on v. 8. **Proinde.** See note on v. 314. **Proinde aliis ut credat uide,** like *dehinc conicito ceterum* Cas. 94:

Quin edepol etiam si in crucem uis pergere,
Sequi decretumst. Dehinc conicito ceterum.

293. Hegio, followed by Philocrates, walks across the stage to Tyndarus, with whom he converses in the presence of the pretended slave. Philocrates maintains silence during the interview until the critical point is reached in v. 335, when he interferes in his assumed saucy tone. And yet at v. 360 he has to be called across the stage to speak to Tyndarus. How is this to be explained?

It has been already remarked (note on v. 38) that it is the Demonstrative Pronouns *hic*, *iste*, *ille* which play the part of stage-directions in the plays of Plautus. From them we get indications of the position of the speakers on the stage. In referring to Philocrates both Hegio and Tyndarus use the Demonstrative *hic*, 'the person beside us' (vv. 294, 295, 297, 340, 345, 349), designedly varied by *iste* in vv. 301—2, 351 (see notes). But in v. 353, while the terms of the 'aestimatio' are being discussed, he is referred to by Hegio as *ille* in speaking to Tyndarus (vv. 353, 354, 359), and as *iste* in the command to the guards (v. 354). The change of Pronoun indicates a change of position of the actors. At v. 353 Hegio leads Tyndarus aside for a private colloquy about money-matters, and the guards at the same instant move forward towards the other prisoner in obedience

[redacted]

Philocrates, hic fecit, hominem frugi ut facere oportuit.
Nam ego ex hoc quo genere gnatus sis scio; hic fassust mihi.
Haec tu eadem si confiteri uis, tua re feceris:

---

295. nam (n *ex* a) *E* hoc *om. D* sis sci V^1 (*corr. ut vid.* V^2) *E*: sis**scio *J* fassus est *libri* (est *itemque* mi(hi) *in ras. B*) michi *E*
296. tua ex *Valla* (e *Camerarius*)

---

to the instructions which had been given in v. 115. By following the clue supplied by the Pronouns we get, it seems to me, a much more natural view of the situation than if we suppose Hegio at the words *sequere hac me igitur* to have led Philocrates away to another part of the stage, still further removed from Tyndarus, and to have spoken the rest of the line, *eadem ego ex hoc quae uolo exquaesiuero*, after an interval, while walking back again towards Tyndarus. This supposition requires vv. 335—6 to be spoken by Tyndarus (with *hujus* for *mei*), the change in his tone being produced by the excitement caused by Hegio's announcement. Seyffert and Schoell believe that something has been lost in the MSS. after v. 292. **Igitur** merely emphasizes the command, 'follow me then.' Cf. *dic igitur*, *agite igitur*, &c. **Eadem** (sc. *opera*), always with the Future or the equivalent of the Future in Plautus. See note on v. 459. **Exquaesiuero.** On the Tense see note on v. 194. The spelling with *ae* is attested for *Aul.* 800 by Priscian (i. p. 38, 1 H. *transit in i productam ut 'quaero, inquiro, exquiro,' quamvis 'exquaero' Plautus dixit in Aulularia: 'i intro, exquaere, sitne ita ut ego praedico'*), and is often found in our MSS. (For statistics see Ritschl *de Miliario Popilliano*, p. 21.)

295. **Gnatus.** The usual spelling in Plautus seems to be *gnatus* for the Noun, 'son,' and *natus* for the Participle, 'born.' But the Participle retains *g* in the phrase *genere gnatus*, e.g. v. 277 (see note), *Aul.* 778, &c., for the sake of the Alliteration. (Statistics are given by Hey in the Supplement of the *Jahrbücher für Philologie*, 1891.)

296. **Haec...eadem.** *Idem* generally precedes *hic* in Plautus, always in Terence. **Tua re feceris.** The same phrase (or else *tua re causa facere*) is found (with altered meaning) in Petron. 47 and 66, where *re* is changed by editors to *rem*, as it is here to *ex re*. The Ablative however without a Preposition seems to be a genuine Old Latin idiom; and we may compare *tua re feceris* either with *Stich.* 463 *augurium hac facit* or with the classical phrase *tua causa facere*, &c. *Mea refert* will then be the original form of the expression for 'it is my interest,' not *meam rem fert* nor *meae re* (Dat.) *fert* nor *meas res fert.* The emendation *tua ex re* is not altogether a happy one, since the position of *ex* would be abnormal;

Quae tamen sci[o] scire me ex hoc. TYND. Fecit officium hic suum,
Cum tibi est confessus uerum, quamquam uolui sedulo
Meam nobilitatem occultare et genus et diuitias meas,
Hegio; nunc quando patriam et libertatem perdidi,
Non ego istunc me potius quam te metuere aequom censeo.
Vis hostilis cum istoc fecit meas opes aequabiles.
Memini, cum dicto haud audebat: facto nunc laedat licet.

---

297. sci *correxi*: scio *libri* (scito V^2): aio *Schoellius* offitium *VE* 298. quamquam *Camerarius*: quam *libri* 299. diuicias *B* 300. Egio (*ex* Ei-) Nunc patriam (*om.* quando) *J* 301. istuc *VE* equom *J*: equum *ceteri* 302. histilis *D* equabiles *libri* (aeq- *J*) 303. audebat (t *e corr.*) *B* ledat *libri*

---

though we have (in a Canticum) in *Amph.* 570 *quid mali sum, ere, tua ex re promeritus?* (bacchiac) (cf. v. 959 below).

297. **Sci.** Schoell changes *scio* of the MSS. into *aio*, although the iteration of the verb *scio* is a Latin mannerism (e.g. *Most.* 1156, *Poen.* 113, 555, *Stich.* 301, 419; cf. Calvus ap. Sen. *Epp.* xv. 2. 25 *hoc uos scire omnes sciunt*, Persius i. 27, etc.). Leo retains the *scio scire* of the MSS.; and certainly the use of an Imperative in a Relative clause is rare (e.g. Cic. *Senect.* 17. 59). The sense of the passage however rather requires the Imperative, and we find in two MSS. (*VE*) in v. 295 *sci* for *scio*. This I suppose to have come from a marginal correction of *scio* in this line in the Archetype, and to have been wrongly referred to v. 295. Plautus does not often use the 2 Sg. Imperative of *scio*. Where he does, he employs the Future Imperative form, *scito*, the command, owing to the nature of the Verb itself, having necessarily a relation to future time (e.g. *dehinc scito* Asin. 858). In this passage however the Present Imperative form is clearly called for (cf. *Mil.* 282). The reading of some inferior MSS., *scito*, has this in its favour that *scio* has been wrongly substituted for *scito* in some MSS. in v. 438.

298. **Quamquam**, as in v. 272, *Aul.* 123, *Trin.* 787, has the same corrective effect as Greek καίτοι.

301—2. The employment of *istic* in place of the usual *hic* in these lines emphasizes the notion of the transference of ownership, 'that slave of yours, no longer of mine.'

302. **Cum istoc**, Compendiary Comparison. Morris aptly compares Caes. *B. G.* vi. 22 *cum suas quisque opes cum potentissimis aequari videat.*

303. **Memini cum**, μέμνημαι ὅτε. Cic. *Fam.* vii. 28. 1 *Memini cum*

[redacted]

Sed uiden? fortuna humana fingit artatque ut lubet;
Me, qui liber fueram, seruom fecit, e summo infimum:
Qui imperare insueram, nunc alterius imperio obsequor.
Et quidem si, proinde ut ipse fui imperator familiae,
Habeam dominum, non uerear ne iniuste aut grauiter
mi imperet.
Hegio, hoc te monitum, nisi forte ipse non uis, uoluerim.

---

304. furtuna *J* iubet V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* 305. fueram *ex* fuerat *E* 306. alternis *Schoellius*: altrius *Ritschelius Opusc.* I *p.* 436 (*cf.* II *p.* 672 *sq.*) 308. uerear *ex* uerebar *E* iniust aut *E* mihi *libri* 309. 'Heio BV^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* (*ex* Heo): Hegio (H *ex* C) *D*: Egio *J ut vid.* uolueram *libri*: *corr. Brixius*

---

mihi desipere videbare, quod cum istis potius viveres quam nobiscum. So *video quom* with Ind. often takes the place of *video* with Inf. in Plautus, e.g. *Poen.* 723 *Vidistis, leno quom aurum accepit?*, Truc. 112 *Nam ipsi uident, cum eorum agerimus bona*, Bacch. 469 *Quin ego cum peribat uidi, non ex audito arguo.*

304. Philemon fr. 111 K. Ἅπαντα νικᾷ καὶ μεταστρέφει τύχη.

305. **Fueram.** See note on v. 17. **E summo infimum.** Cf. Ennius' lines about Servius Tullius (*Ann.* 337 M.):

mortalem summum Fortuna repente
Reddidit, ut summo regno famul oltimus esset,

with contrast of *summus* and *ultimus*, for which Lucretius in his imitation substitutes *infimus* (iii. 1034):

Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror,
Ossa dedit terrae proinde ac famul infimus esset.

306. **Insueram** (on the tense see note on v. 17). As a general rule forms like *amaram*, *amarunt*, *amaro*, *amarim* are normal in the Dramatists, the full forms *amaveram*, *amaverunt*, *amavero*, *amaverim* being used for metrical convenience at the end of a line or hemistich. The derivatives of Perfects in *-ēvi* are however not quite so readily contracted as the others, except in certain verbs, such as *decerno*, *assuesco*, *consuesco*, *quiesco*. We have in Plautus *consuerunt*, *decrero*, *insueram*, *quierint.* (For statistics see Brock, *Quaestiones Grammaticae*, pp. 97 sqq.) **Alterius.** I doubt the form '*altrius*' (see note on v. 8).

307. **Proinde ut.** See note on v. 314 below. **Ut...fui.** Cf. *ita esse*, and see note on *ita uidere*, v. 120. **Imperator familiae,** "an exaggerated phrase, intended to make an impression upon Hegio." Morris. Rather *imp.* has its original sense 'qui imperat.'

309. **Hoc te monitum...uoluerim.** Cf. v. 53. **Nisi forte ipse non uis.** Cf. *Curc.* 82 *nisi neuis*; Men. 787 *Nisi non uis*; Trin. 328 *si tu*

HEG. Loquere audacter. TYND. Tam ego fui ante liber quam gnatus tuus;
Tam mihi quam illi libertatem hostilis eripuit manus;
Tam ille apud nos seruit, quam ego nunc hic apud te seruio.
Est profecto deus, qui quae nos gerimus auditque et uidet:
Is, uti tu me hic habueris, proinde illum illic curauerit;

---

311. illi *s. v. D* 312. aput nos B^1EJ aput te B^1 seruio *ex* seruit *D* 313. qui quae B^3V^2: quique B^1DV^1EJ audique *V*

---

non neuis; 1156 *nisi tu neuis*,—all variations of the same polite formula. The older forms *nevis, nevolt* have so often been 'modernized' in the MSS. to *nonvis, nonvolt* (e.g. *Trin.* 328 *si tu non neuis* P, *nisi tu nonuis* A; *Trin.* 361 *quae neuult* P, *quae nonuolt* A) that it is difficult to determine what principle regulates the usage of *nevis* and *nonvis* &c. by Plautus. Apparently *nevis* and *nevolt* were forms going out of use in Plautus' time and were only used by him for metrical reasons, e.g. at the end of the line or hemistich. **Voluerim.** The MSS. have *uolueram*, which must mean, 'I had wished' (before such and such an event happened) (see note on v. 17), and therefore fits awkwardly with this context. Still it may be right, for *uolueram* is a common expression, e.g. *Rud.* 708 *optume: istuc uolueramus.*

313. The sceptical theory is expressed by a speaker in the *Telamo* of Ennius (Trag. 269 R.):

Ego deum genus esse semper dixi et dicam caelitum,
Sed eos non curare opinor, quid agat humanum genus:
Nam si curent, bene bonis sit, male malis, quod nunc abest.

Auditque et uidet. We find *que—et* frequently with similar pairs of words, e.g. *Amph.* prol. 5 *peregrique et domi*, Asin. 283 *gnatoque et patri*, *Mil.* 1315 *materque et soror*, Poen. prol. 3 *Sileteque et tacete.* For the Mood after *est qui* cf. *Poen.* 1119 *est qui illam conuentam esse uolt*, Trin. 91 *Sunt quos scio esse amicos, sunt quos suspicor*, Auct. ad Her. iv. 17. 24 *sunt autem sententiae quae dupliciter efferuntur*, Cic. *Top.* 10, 42, *Att.* x. 4. 11 *sunt autem quae praeterii.*

314. **Vti** suits the impressive diction (see note on v. 115). **Proinde.** The *ut*-clause precedes, as in Ter. *Hec.* 218 *Ideo quia, ut domi mihi uos eritis, proinde ego ero fama foris.* Cf. *Stich.* 520 *Ut quoique homini res paratast, perinde amicis utitur.* Normally the words *proinde ut* (*uti* at the end of the line, *Amph.* 214; in a lyric passage, *Most.* 96) in comparisons

[redacted]

Bene merenti bene profuerit, male merenti par erit.
Quam tu filium tuum, tam pater me meus desiderat.
HEG. Memini ego istoc. Sed faterin eadem quae hic fassust mihi?
TYND. Ego patri meo esse fateor summas diuitias domi
Meque summo genere gnatum. Sed te optestor, Hegio,
Ne tuum animum auariorem faxint diuitiae meae:

---

317. ego *ex* ist- *B* faterin (n *ex* m) *D*: frater in V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* fassus est *libri* michi *J* *vv.* 318—324 *initia in rasura scripsit* E^1
318. patri (i *ex* e) *D* diuicias *B* 319. Meque *ex* Meique *VE* optestor B^3 *ut vid.* V^2: optector B^1DV^1: obtector *E*: obstentor *J* egio *J*
320. animum (*ut vid.*) tuum J^1 (*corr. ut vid. a scriba ipso*) mee *J*

---

are in juxtaposition (but *Amph.* 960 *Proinde eri ut sint, ipse item sit*, where *eri* is emphatic; *Amph.* 982 *proinde adeo ut*), just as in commands *proin tu* (see note on v. 865). In *Amph.* 973 *Recte loquere et proinde diligentem ut uxorem decet*, the correction *diligentem proinde ut* is favoured by the fact that, although Terence occasionally uses *proinde* (a disyllable) before a consonant, Plautus never does (see note on v. 933). In the comparative use, *proinde...quasi* (with Subj.) is used when the type of comparison is not a fact, e.g. *Poen.* 845 *Proinde habet orationem, quasi ipse sit frugi bonae. Proinde...quam* is once found (*Truc.* 324 *Si proinde amentur mulieres, diu quam lauant*); and *proinde ac* in *Amph.* 583 *proinde ac meritus es.* But since in *Trin.* 659 *proinde ut* appears as *proinde ac* in one family of MSS., there is a possibility of *ac* in this line of the *Amphitruo* having been similarly substituted for *ut.* **Habueris...curauerit.** On the Fut. Perf. see note on v. 194.

315. *Asin.* 129 *Bene merenti mala es, male merenti bona es.*

317. **Istoc.** This reading of the MSS. seems a genuine trace of the older spelling and should not be changed to *istuc.* The short *o* was weakened to *u* in the second (unaccented) syllable of *illud, illuc, istud* (not in Plautus), *istuc*, but maintained itself, though not without a struggle (cf. *ad huc templum*, C. I. L. i. 603), in the monosyllable *hoc*, of which the Adverb *huc* (see note on v. 480) seems to be the unaccented form. There seems to me no reason for supposing an original *istuc* in this line to have been changed by a scribe to *istoc.*

319. **Summo genere gnatum** (see note on v. 295). **Te optestor** (cf. v. 727), always in this order in the Dramatists.

320. **Faxint** (see note on v. 172).

321—3. The Captives had evidently discussed with each other the possibility of Hegio's fixing too high a ransom. The absurdly exaggerated

Ne patri, tametsi unicus sum, decere uideatur magis
Me saturum seruire apud te sumptu et uestitu tuo
Potius quam illi, ubi minime honestumst, mendicantem uiuere.
HEG. Ego uirtute deum et maiorum nostrum diues sum satis.

---

321. sum unicus *Muellerus* decore *Schoellius* 322. aput *J* 323. illi *ex* ulli *ras. B* illic *V²* (*etiam var. lect. in J*) honestu est *BD*: honestust *E*: honestum est *VJ* 324. *versum del. Ritschelius Opusc.* II *p.* 283 uirtutem *V²* (*deinde corr.* -te *ut vid.*) *J* deum *in ras. B³* maiorum *ex* magiorum *D*

---

remarks made by Philocrates in the character of the saucy slave (vv. 287 sqq.) have the same design as this more temperate suggestion of Tyndarus in the character of the master.

321. The reading of the MSS. seems to require a dactyl-word *unicus* to constitute a foot, the third foot, a thing not sanctioned in trochaic metre, except at the beginning of the line or hemistich; though this difficulty would be removed if we supposed *unicus-sum* to form a word-group, like *accipedum* &c. The reading might also stand if *unicus* were here pronounced *uncus*, as *aridus* is on occasion pronounced *ardus* (*Aul.* 297 *Pumex non aeque est ardus atque hic est senex*). In *Cas.* 264 the reading of the MSS. points to *Nihilo magis uncust* (*unicus est* MSS.) *illé mihi filius quam ego illi pater*, but editors transpose *ille únicust.* Leo adopts C. F. Mueller's transposition, *sum unicus.* This however requires the very doubtful scansion *patrī* (see Introd. iii. § 26). Schoell changes *decere* to *decore* Neut. of an Adj. *decōris.* Bentley suggested *esse e re*, which, if written *ēē e re*, might easily become *ecere* and then *decere.* **Tametsi** is trisyllabic (if the reading be right) in a lyric passage, *Pseud.* 244 *tam étsi occupátu's* (bacchiac), but was apparently pronounced rather as a disyllable with accent on *et*, for in Plautus the normal metrical ictus is *t(am)étsi.* The Conjunction is normally followed by the Ind. in Plautus. (For *Trin.* 679 *Fácilest inuentú: datur ignis tam étsi ab inimicó petas* cf. note on v. 221 above.) **Magis**, followed by *potius* (v. 323). Cf. *Trin.* 274 *Eo mihi magis lubet cum probis potius Quam cum improbis uiuere uanidicis*, Asin. 689 *magis decorumst Libertum potius quam patronum onus in uia portare*, Cist. 42 *At satius fuerat eam uiro dare nuptum potius*, Merc. 898 *neque est quoi magis me uelle melius aequom siet*, Stich. 97 *Quem aequiust nos potiorem habere quam te?* (see note on v. 687).

323. **Mendicantem** (see note on v. 13).

324. This line recurs in the *Aulularia* (v. 166), where it is put in the mouth of Megadorus, the wooer of the miser's daughter. Ritschl supposed it to be an interpolation here (see note on vv. 46—51), because *nostrum* is

Non ego omnino lucrum omne esse utile homini existumo:
Scio ego, multos iam lucrum lutulentos homines reddidit;
Est etiam ubi profecto damnum praestet facere quam lucrum.
Odi ego aurum: multa multis saepe suasit perperam.
Nunc hoc animum aduorte, ut ea quae sentio pariter scias.

---

325. omnem *J* existumo *J*: existimo *ceteri* (et istimo *D*) **326.** lutulentos *B*: luculentos *cett.* **327.** dampnum *J* prestet *libri* **328.** ego (g *ex* r) *B* sepe *DVEJ et in* 6 *litt. ras.* B^3 **329.** aduortite *libri* (*corr.* V^2J) (*J vix leg.*) sencio *V*

---

peculiarly appropriate to the *Aulularia* passage, where Megadorus is speaking to his sister. On the other hand the word here has a significance for the audience who know that Hegio is really speaking with his own son. The repetition of a commonplace of the kind is not sufficient cause for suspicion. There is a somewhat similar line in the *Persa* (v. 390):

Pol deum uirtute dicam et maiorum meum,
Ne te indotatam dicas, quoi dos sit domi.

326. **Lucrum lutulentos.** We find the same assonance in S. Augustin. *Conf.* v. 12 *lucrum luteum quod cum adprehenditur, manum inquinat.*

327. Ter. *Adel.* 216 *Pecuniam in loco neclegere maxumum interdumst lucrum.* **Est ubi...praestet.** For the Mood cf. *Men.* 457 *Adfatim est hominum in dies qui singulas escas edint, Quibus negoti nihil est,* Ter. *Haut.* 1024 *Si umquam ullum fuit tempus, mater, cum ego uoluptati tibi Fuerim.* Cf. *Most.* 158, *Haut.* 232. **Profecto damnum praestet.** Brix proposes *profecto praestet damnum,* in order to keep the two alliterative words together (cf. ad v. 476).

328. **Multa multis saepe.** On the pleonasm see note on v. 44. **Perperam** Adv. The Adj. *perperus* is used by Accius in his poem on stage technique (*Pragmaticon* fr. inc. i. M.), a precursor of Horace's *Ars Poetica: discribere in theatro perperos* | *Popularis,* along with the derivative Noun *perperitudo* (fr. inc. ii. M.):

Et eo plectuntur poetae quam suo uitio saepius
Ductabilitate <animi> nimia uestra aut perperitudine.

329. **Hoc animum aduorte.** That *hoc* in this familiar phrase (cf. *Curc.* 270, *Mil.* 766, *Pers.* 116, *Trin.* 1046) is not the O. Lat. Adverb '**hither**' (cf. v. 480), but Acc. of the object, is proved by lines like:

Filius meus illic apud uos seruit captus Alide:
Eum si reddis mihi, praeterea unum nummum ne duis;

---

330. *post* seruit 5 *litt.*, alide *ut vid.*, *er. B* (captus alide *add. B*[2]) *post* captus 3 *litt. spat. D* 331. preterea *B* dius *DE*: duis *ex* dius *ut vid. V*

Pseud. 143 Nunc adeo hanc edictionem nisi animum aduortetis omnes.

Epid. 215 Id adeo qui maxime animum aduorterim.

Ter. *Phorm.* 467 Alios tuam rem credidisti magis quam tete animum aduorsuros.

Andr. 156 Ea primum ab illo animum aduortenda iniuriast.

Andr. 767 O facinus animum aduortendum.

Cato *Agr. C.* i. 2 Vicini quo pacto niteant, id animum aduortito.

Orat. (p. 36, 5 Jord.) Id ego primo minus animum aduorti.

Cf. *Curc.* 635 *Hanc rem agite atque animum aduortite*, Pseud. 153 *Hoc agite, hoc animum aduortite.* In the prologue to the *Amphitruo* we find a departure from this usage of the early writers (v. 38):

Nunc iam huc animum omnes quae loquar aduortite.

But the line is condemned as un-Plautine by another irregularity too, the separation of *animum* from *aduorto*; for *animum aduorto*, for which the frequentative form *animum aduorso* is found in *Rud.* 306, is already a word-group in Plautus, as it became later a single word *animadverto* (cf. *magnopere*, &c. from *magno opere*, &c.). Apparently the original construction of the phrase made *animum* Acc. of Motion, so that *hoc animum aduorto* meant literally, 'I turn this into my mind.' (See note on *istuc... animum induxis* v. 149.) Instead of the Acc. alone an Acc. with Inf. appears in Ter. *Phorm.* 909 &c.:

Postquam id tanto opere uos uelle animaduerteram.

We have of course quite a different phrase in *Mil.* 39 *Facete aduortis animum tuom ad animum meum.* **Ut ea quae sentio pariter scias,** a familiar formula, which recurs in various shapes, e.g. *Asin.* 28 *ut ipse scibo, te faciam ut scias*, 332 *ut aeque mecum haec scias*, Epid. 505 A. *Volo scire si scis.* B. *Id quod audiui audies*, Merc. 152 *Ut quae scirem scire actutum tibi liceret*, Mil. 233 *ut scias Iuxta mecum mea consilia*, Pseud. 72 *Haec quae ego sciui ut scires curaui omnia.*

330. **Illic apud uos.** Plautus may have written *illi* (see note on v. 261). **Alide.** See note on v. 94.

331. **Si reddis.** For the tense cf.:

Epid. 605 Ego relictis rebus Epidicum operam quaerendo dabo.
Si inuenio, exitiabilem ego illi faciam hunc ut fiat diem.

[redacted]

Et te et hunc amittam hinc. Alio pacto abire non potes.
TYND. Optumum atque aequissimum oras optumusque hominum es homo.
Sed is priuatam seruitutem seruit illi an publicam?
HEG. Priuatam medici Menarchi. PHIL. Pol is quidem huius est cliens.
Tam hoc quidem tibi in procliui quam imber est quando pluit.

---

332. *Post* et *2 litt.*, et *ut vid.*, *er. B* admittam *E* 333. Optimum *J* equissimum *BVE* homo es *B*: es homo *ex* homo es *D*: esse homo V^1: est homo *E ut vid.*: es homo V^2J 334. HEG. *praem. libri* (*J n. l.*) priuatum V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* seruit—publicam *in ras. J* 335. TYND. *praem. libri* (*J n. l.*) Priuatum V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* menarchi *ex* narchi *D*: menarchy *VE* HEG. *libri*: TYND. ϛ: *corr. Camerarius* is *Fleckeisenus*: hic *libri* clienius (*fort.* cliens *cum* s *prave corr.*) *J* 336. TYND. *praem. libri* (*J n. l.*) procliue *B*: prodiui *J* ymber *VE*

Mil. 266 Si inuenio qui uidit, ad eum uineam pluteosque agam.
268 Si ita non reperio, ibo odorans quasi canis uenaticus.
Pseud. 586 Atque huc meas legiones adducam; si hoc expugno, facilem hanc rem meis ciuibus faciam.
Trin. 156 Nunc si ille huc saluos reuĕnit, reddam suom sibi.

Ne duis. Cf. v. 947 and see note on v. 728. *Rud.* 1367 *mihi triobulum Ob eam ne duis: condono te.*

332. **Amittam.** See note on v. 36.

333. **Optumum atque aequissimum oras,** a common formula, e.g. *Epid.* 725, &c. **Oras.** See note on v. 942. **Optumus hominum... homo,** a common type of Superlative; cf. Ter. *Adel.* 218 *hominum homo stultissume.* In the Scipio epitaph (quoted in the note on v. 278) *duonoro optumo...uiro*, 'bonorum optimum...virum,' there is reference to the title which Livy tells us the senate conferred in 204 B.C. on P. Scipio Nasica (Liv. xxix. 14. 8): *iudicauerunt eum esse...virum bonorum optimum.*

334. **Seruitutem seruit** (cf. ad v. 544). **Illi.** The preservation in this line of the old form of the Adverb in the MSS. (cf. ad v. 60) was probably due to its being mistaken for the Dative.

335—6. The tone of these lines shews that they come from the pretended slave, Philocrates, and the use of *tibi* suggests that they are not spoken 'aside' to the audience (see note on v. 293).

335. **Is.** On *hic* of the MSS. see the note on v. 19. **Pol is quidem,** as in *Men.* 497 *pol eam quidem*, and elsewhere.

336. **In procliui,** 'on the down-slope,' i.e. easily set in motion. *Proclivis*, for which in the *Miles Gloriosus* the earlier type of Compound is

HEG. Fac is homo ut redimatur. TYND. Faciam; sed te id oro, Hegio—
HEG. Quid uis, dum ab re ne quid ores, faciam. TYND. Ausculta, tum scies.
Ego me amitti, donicum ille huc redierit, non postulo.

---

337. Facis (*sic libri*) homo ut redimatur? *B* (*signum interrogationis add.* B^2) redimator V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* fatiam *E* *fort.* ted oro 338—339. *versus laudat Priscianus Inst.* xv *p.* 74, 12 *H.* (*testans* donicum) 'ausculta...redierit' 338. fatiam *E* scias *B* 339. admitti *E* donicum *testatur Priscianus, hinc excerpsit glossar. Plaut. p.* 58, 3 *H.* (*cf. Ritschelius Opusc.* II *p.* 241 *sq.*): donec cum *libri* *post* redierit *spat. in D*

---

found, *proclivus* (cf. *inermus*, *sublimus* older forms of *inermis*, *sublimis*) is generally used as a figure of difficulty, 'uphill' work, in opposition to *planus*, e.g. *Mil.* 1018 *fecisti modo mi ex procliuo planum* (cf. *Rud.* 1132), *Asin.* 663 *Nam istuc proclive est, quo iubes me plane collocare.* But we have the same expression as here in Ter. *Andr.* 701 *Id faciam, in procliui quod est.* Cf. Seneca *Apol.* 13. 3 *omnia procliuia sunt, facile descenditur.*

337. **Fac is...ut.** We should expect *fac eum hominem ut*, as in v. 610, *Asin.* 28 *te faciam ut scias*, Pseud. 214 *te...faciam ut deportere*, Asin. 140 *te faciam ut...quae fueris scias.* We have the Nominative also in Terence *Eun.* 1042 *Tu frater ubi ubi est fac quam primum haec audiat.* **Is homo** is used again by Hegio of his son in v. 989. In the colloquial Latin of the Dramatists the word *homo* plays as great a part as its descendants in Romance languages, e.g. *hombre* in Spanish. Thus *homo* practically takes the place of the Third Personal Pronoun in lines like *Asin.* 596 *homo hercle hinc exclusust foras*, Phorm. 252 *Sed quid cessas hominem adire et blande in principio adloqui?* Hegio's *is homo* is equivalent to *is* merely. The Hiatus before *Hegio*, which is perhaps legitimate (see note on v. 426), is removed by some editors who read *sed ted* (or *tecum*) *oro* <*hoc*> *Hegio.* But the normal order is that a Personal Pron. in an Oblique Case follows a Demonstr. In this very phrase, for example, we have *hoc te oro* Ter. *Haut.* 623, *id te oro* Andr. 556 (cf. 548). The *te id* of the MSS. may well be a corruption of *ted.* If we retain *id*, we must suppose the remark of Tyndarus to be interrupted by Hegio (see note on v. 253).

338. **Ausculta, tum scies.** *Asin.* 350 *ausculta ergo: scies*, Bacch. 1023 *em specta, tum scies.* The proposal of Brix to read *auscultadum* <*ut*> *scias* must be rejected, for *auscultadum* is not found in Plautus, while *tum scies* recurs in *Bacch.* 1023 (just quoted) and *Bacch.* 145 *quom uidebis, tum scies.* That *scies* was the reading of the common original (P^{BD}) of our MSS. is proved by the 'consensus' of *D V E.*

339. **Donicum.** The older form would be *donecum*, if the word is

[redacted]

Verum te quaeso [ut] aestumatum hunc mihi des, quem mittam ad patrem,
Vt is homo redimatur illi. HEG. Immo alium potius misero
Hinc, ubi erunt indutiae, illuc, tuum qui conueniat patrem,
Qui tua quae tu iusseris mandata ita ut uelis perferat.
TYND. At nihil est ignotum ad illum mittere: operam luseris.

---

340. te *ex* oe *J* queso *BVE* *del.* ut *Bosscha* aestimatur *ex* -tum *D*: estimatum *E*: aestimatum *J* 341. his *V* illic *V*[2]*J* initio *J* misero (ero *in ras.*) *B* 342. indutiae (t *ex* c) *B* conuenit *libri*: *corr.* *ς* 343. tu *ex* tua *D* 344. nichil *E* (*ex* m) *J* (i *supra*) *post* mittere *spat.* (*pers. spat. ut vid.*) *BD* oper**am *J*[1] (*corr. ras. J*[2])

---

really derived from the old Preposition *dō*, Engl. 'to,' and the affix *-ne* of *pone* Prep. &c., followed by *cum*, 'when.' But it would be rash to find a trace of this old spelling in the reading of the MSS. *donec cum*. Rather we have here, as in v. 28, a substitution of a gloss for the word over which the gloss was written. The false etymology of *donicum* as *donec cum* may have given rise to the classical form *donec* (with the *cum* dropped), unless *donec* and *donicum* are related as *nihil* and *nihilum*, while the *donique* of Lucretius may be a by-form of *donec* like *neque* beside *nec*.

340. **Aestumatum...des.** *Merc.* 95 *mihi meus pater Dedit aestimatas merces: ita peculium Conficio grande.* *Ut* has similarly been inserted in *Mil.* 1362 (*quaeso memineris* B, *quaeso ut memineris* CD). Brix prefers to remove *te*, and read *uerum quaeso ut* (cf. vv. 949, 1025); but cf. v. 432. Niemeyer may be right in retaining *te quaeso ut* (cf. *Amph.* 933, *Aul.* 611, also *Cas.* 389, 396) with the scansion *út ăestumatum*.

341. **Vt is homo redimatur illi.** This repetition of Hegio's words (v. 337) would, I fancy, be uttered with stress of the voice on *ut*, 'Effect his ransom...That I *may* effect his ransom.' **Alium potius.** This is the normal position of *potius*. Cf. *Most.* 668 *Di istum perduint—Immo istunc potius*, Bacch. 211 *Immo hercle abiero potius*, &c. **Misero.** On the Tense see note on v. 194.

342. An inducement to select an Elean subject for the mission would undoubtedly be the avoidance of delay till a truce was made.

344. **Nihil est**, 'it is no use,' a common expression, e.g. *Truc.* 769 *De nihilo nihil est irasci.* **Operam luseris.** Both *operam ludere*, and

Hunc mitte, hic transactum reddet omne, si illuc uenerit.
Neque quemquam fideliorem neque cui plus credat potes
Mittere ad eum neque qui magis sit seruus ex sententia,
Neque adeo cui suum concredat filium hodie audacius.
Ne uereare, meo periclo huius ego experiar fidem,

---

345. mitte *ex* mittere *D* omne t. r. *libri*: *corr. Guietus* optume t. r. *Skutschius* reddet *ex* -it *B* **346.** Ne *libri* (Nec *J*) plus (l *ex* i) *D* craedat *ut vid. B* **347.** nequi *libri* (nec qui *J*) seruus] *J n. l.* **348.** hodiem *D* audacius *ex* -tius *D*: audatius *VE J ut vid.* **349.** periculo *B*: periclo *ex* perido *J* ego huius *Fleckeisenus*, *Kaempfius* '*de pron. pers.*' *p.* 25 uice fidem *BD*: uicem fidem V^1E: uicem uel fidem V^2: fidem uel uicem *J*

(more frequent) *operam perdere*, are the Roman expressions for 'labour lost,' e.g. *Cas.* 424 *meam operam luserim*, Pseud. 369 *operam ludimus*, Ter. *Phorm.* 332 *in illis opera luditur.*

345. **Transactum reddet**, a periphrasis for *transiget.* In such uses *reddo*, *facio*, *do*, &c. are practically Auxiliary Verbs in colloquial Latin.

346 sqq. Tyndarus of course utters these words in such a way as to make his Elean master sensible of the allusion. To change (with Schoell) *concredat* (v. 348) into *concredas* is to lose sight of this fact. Philocrates' father had entrusted the care of his son to Tyndarus (v. 708). **Neque quemquam.** The reading of the MSS. here (due to Haplography) is hardly sufficient evidence of a Plautine Pronoun *nĕquisquam* (cf. *nĕquiquam* Adv.).

347. *Pers.* 10 *Ego neque lubenter seruio neque satis sum ero ex sententia.* **Sit.** For the Mood cf. *Mil.* 784 *dum modo Eam des quae sit quaestuosa*, *Mil.* 686, *Most.* 557, *Pseud.* 724.

348. **Neque adeo**, a common phrase; cf. v. 519. **Hodie**, as in Virg. *Ecl.* iii. 49 *Numquam hodie effugies*, and often in colloquial Latin. Cf. Donatus ad Ter. *Adel.* II. ii. 7 '*hodie*' *non tempus significat, sed iracundam eloquentiam ac stomachum.*

349. **Experiar**, 'I will make trial of' (*periculum faciam*), as in *Amph.* 662, &c. Since Hiatus at the Diaeresis is allowable (Introd. ii. § 37), there is no metrical necessity for the transposition *ego huius*, though it is strongly supported by the normal arrangement of the Nom. of the Pers. Pron. before the Demonstr. (cf. note on v. 731). The precedence of *huius* here may however be justified by the emphasis laid on the Demonstrative throughout the remarks of Tyndarus (cf. v. 345 *Hunc mitte, hic transactum reddet*). *Huiusce* is an unlikely form (see note on prol. 10) in any part of the line; *periculo* (see note on v. 740) in any except the end. The reading of the MSS. *huius uicem fidem* is due to the scribe of some original who wrote in

[redacted]

Fretus ingenio eius, quod me esse scit erga sese beneuolum.

HEG. Mittam equidem istunc aestumatum tua fide, si uis. TYND. Volo;

Quam citissime potest, tam hoc cedere ad factum uolo.

---

350. eius *in ras. D* esse *ex* i- *B* erga se *B* sese erga *Muellerus Pros. p.* 68, *Bentleius* beniuolum *BJ* 351. istum *libri*: *corr. Camerarius* aestymatum *B*: estumatum *VE* *ante* tua 2 *litt. er. in B* sinis V^1 (*corr.* V^2): suus *J* 352. *ex hoc versu* citissime *excerpsit Glossar. Plaut. p.* 58, 8 *H.* hoc (*ex* hic *ut vid.*) *V* credere *J*: 2 *litt. spat. et ante et post* cedere *B* HEG. Quam c. p. tam hoc iter eat. TYND. Factum uolo *Schoellius*

---

error *huius uicem* for *huius fidem* and then added *fidem* without erasing *uicem* (see note on v. 199).

350. That *sese* was the reading of the common original (P^{BD}) of our MSS. is proved by the 'consensus' of *D* with *VE.* The reading *se* has therefore not much authority. If we retain *sese*, we must either scan *esse* as one syllable, with suppression of the final -ĕ (Introd. ii. § 14) or, what is more justifiable, scan *esse scit* as a dactyl, the long *i* of *scīt* (Introd. ii. § 1) being shortened by the Law of Breves Breviantes (Introd. ii. § 21) (cf. v. 243 *esse nunc*). Schoell adopts the reading *sese erga* (cf. v. 416).

351. **Istunc,** 'your slave, recommended by you,' in place of an Aetolian messenger of my own choosing. The Hiatus in the version of the MSS. (*istum aest.*) might also be removed by the transposition *istum tua fide aestumatum*, which gives a line without Diaeresis.

352. **Quam citissime...tam,** a somewhat infrequent patchwork of *quam potest tam* with Positive and *quam* with Superl. **Potest** in these common colloquial phrases, *quantum potest*, *quam primum potest*, *quam celerrime potest*, &c., is impersonal (see note on v. 398). **Cedere ad factum** (apparently Acc. of the Verbal Noun *factus*, *-us*), 'to pass into operation,' is probably a translation of *χωρεῖν πρὸς ἔργον*. *Ad effectum adduci*, *ad effectum festinare*, *ad effectum venire* are the classical Latin expressions. Hallidie proposes *te dare effectum* (cf. Ter. *Eun.* 212 *effectum dabo*). Brix explains *uolo* (*eum*) *cedere ad hoc factum* (Neut.) (cf. Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 30, 84 *ad maleficium accedere*). Schoell rewrites the line:

> HEG. Quam citissume potest, tam hoc iter eat. TYND. Factum uolo.

The blank space on each side of the word *cedere* in *B* does not seem to me to prove that a change of speaker was indicated in the original. Rather the scribe was at first doubtful how to write *cedere* and left a space for the word which he filled in later.

HEG. Num quae causa est quin, si ille huc non redeat, uiginti minas
Mihi des pro illo? TYND. Optuma immo. HEG. Soluite istum nunciam,
Atque utrumque. TYND. Di tibi omnis omnia optata offerant,
Cum me tanto honore honestas cumque ex uinclis eximis.

---

353. Numque *J* 354. Michi *E* optuma *E*: optima *BDV*^{1}: optimae *V*^{2}: optume *J* istum *ex* istuc *V* 355. dii *J* omnes *J* ferant *libri*: afferant *Camerarius*: offerant *Fleckeisenus* 356. uinculis *J*

---

353. **Num quae causa est** (never 'est causa') is a common formula, of which other forms are *num quid causae est* and *num quam causam dicis.* If, as this passage indicates (cf. *Amph.* 852), it was a formula appropriate to a bargain (*conventio*), this will be the point of the joke in *Pseud.* 533, where a master is speaking to a slave:

> *A.* Sed si non faxis, numquid causaest ilico
> Quin te in pistrinum condam? *B.* Non unum in diem,
> Verum hercle in omnis, quantumst.

(But cf. Ter. *Andr.* 600.)

354. **Illo** is changed by some editors to *illoc.* **Optuma immo.** *Aul.* 262 A. *Sed nuptias Hodie quin faciamus numquae causa* [*est*]?— B. *Immo edepol optuma* (cf. *Trin.* 1188 and see note on v. 625). The unusual position of *immo* finds a parallel in *Aul.* 765 A. *Negas?* B. *Pernego immo.*

355. **Atque**, introducing a second thought, as in *Rud.* 121 *dabitur opera atque in negotio*, and in the common phrase *atque audin?* See note on v. 585. **Offerant.** The MSS. have *ferant. Afferant*, though more easily justified on palaeographical grounds, for *optata afferant* would readily become *optataferant* in a copy, is appropriate to the sense of 'bringing a message,' and the like (cf. however *Rud.* 666 *salutem a.*, Amph. prol. 32 [spoken by Mercury] *pacem a.*, Epid. 660 *auxilium a.*, &c.). *Offerant* is the suitable word for this context (see note on v. 230) and helps the alliteration. Its claim to be here is put beyond a doubt by the parallel in Ter. *Adelph.* 978 *Di tibi, Demea, omnes semper omnia optata offerant.*

356. **Cum** causal, with Ind. (see note on v. 151). **Honore honestas** (cf. ad v. 247).

[redacted]

Hoc quidem haud molestumst iam, quod collus collari caret.

HEG. Quod bonis bene fit beneficium, gratia ea grauida est bonis.

Nunc tu illum si illo es missurus, dice, [de]monstra, praecipe

---

357. *versum laudat Donatus art. gramm.* III 2 *p.* 393, 31 *K.* 'collus coll. caret' haud *ex* aud *V*: aut *E* molestumst *E*: molestum est *cett.* tam *D* collaria caret *libri* (collocaria *ut vid.* J^1: collaria J^2): collari caret *Bothius*, *Bentleius*: collaria caret *ex* collari caret *Leid. Don.*: collarigaret *Julianus*: collaria caret *Berol. Don.*: collaria (*ex* -rio) caret *Par. Don.* 358. *Hegioni Camerarius dedit*: *Tyndaro continuant libri* (*cf. ad v.* 359) bene sit *J* benefitium *VE* 359. *Hegionis pers. praem. libri*: *del. Camerarius* illum *ex* illim *B* monstra *Camerarius* precipe *BV*

---

357. Perhaps this is an 'aside.' **Iam.** We should punctuate after, rather than before, this word. **Collus.** The Indo-European word for the neck was *kolsos* (Masc.), whence Germ. *Hals* (Masc.). The Latin word has the Masculine form invariably in Plautus (*Amph.* 445, *Capt.* 902, *Pers.* 691, *Rud.* 888) and in the early writers. It is in Cicero that we first find it in the form *collum.* **Collari.** Cf. Nonius 36 M. 24: *Collare est vinculi genus, quo collum adstringitur. Lucilius lib.* xxviii.:

> Cum manicis catulo collarique, ut fugitiuum
> Deportem.

The word is really an Adj. *collare* (*ferrum*), 'the iron for the neck,' like *calcar*(*e*) (*ferrum*), 'the iron for the heel.' "*Collare* can be nothing but an iron ring or band. It is portable (see Lucilius, just quoted), and forms part of a set of light *catenae* (*Capt.* 112). In Varro *R. R.* ii. 9. 15 it is a spiked leathern dog-collar." (Allen in *Harvard Studies* vii. p. 42.)

358. *Pers.* 674 *siquid bonis Boni fit, esse idem et graue et gratum solet*, *Rud.* 939 *bonis quod bene fit haud perit*; cf. *Poen.* 635–6. This 'wise saw' has the same ring as Hegio's former utterance on the need of caution, v. 255, and is, like it, better appreciated by the audience than by Hegio himself. There is good reason for assigning the line to Hegio, and not, as the MSS. assign it, to Tyndarus.

359. **Dice.** The three Imperatives *dice*, *duce*, *face* drop their final -ĕ in classical Latin, owing to their frequent use in word-groups, i.e. in close connexion with a following word. We see the curtailment in process of completion in the plays of Plautus, who regularly uses *dic mihi*, *fac sciam*,

Quae ad patrem uis nuntiari. Vin uocem huc ad te?
TYND. Voca.

HEGIO senex, PHILOCRATES adolescens, TYNDARVS seruus. II. iii.

HEG. Quae res bene uortat mihi meoque filio

---

360. nunciari *BD*.
II. iii. EGIO *J* PHILOCRATES (P *ex* F) *B* ADVLESCENS *V* TYNDARVS *ex* TYDARVS *B*: TINDARVS *J* *unius v. spat.* *D*
361. HEG. *praem.* B^3V^2J: TYND. V^1E Que *B*: ue *c. sp. in.* V^1 (q *in marg.* V^2) uortat *ex* uortant *D* mihi B^3V^2: michi *J*: meo B^1 *ut vid.* DV^1E

---

dic quid est, &c., but *dice* before an initial vowel or when there is anything of a pause after the word, e.g. *Rud.* 124 A. *Tu, siquid opus est, dice.* B. *Dic quod te rogo.* Even in Terence *face* is the form used at the end of a line. *Fer*, it should be noticed, belongs to a different category; for this was a Verb of the Athematic Conjugation in Indo-European and (like *es* Imper. of *sum*) never had a final *-ĕ*. The reading of the MSS. may be retained if we pronounce *dice* as *dic*, or if we scan *dice dĕmonstra* by the Law of Breves Breviantes (cf. the note on *esse scit* v. 350). But in *Mil.* 256 we have *dice, monstra, praecipe*:

eam ‸iube
Cito domum transire, atque haec ei dice, monstra, praecipe.

360. **Ad patrem.** Cf. ad v. 400. **Vin uocem.** "This paratactic construction is used 23 times in Plaut. (*Capt.* 858, *Pseud.* 324, 522, &c.), always with 1st pers., while *uin me facere* is used only three times." Morris.

Act II. Scene iii. For Scene-heading we should expect merely EIDEM (cf. the heading of II. ii.); and indeed the only reason for making a new Scene begin here is the change of metre, a consideration that ought to tell equally at v. 385. The interview, now that the critical stage has been passed, takes the quieter metre of Iambic Senarii, but when the time comes for the impressive leave-taking between Philocrates and Tyndarus, it becomes again Trochaic Septenarii (v. 385). The dialogue in this last part, where the play almost rises to the level of Tragedy, is very skilfully arranged. All that Tyndarus says to Philocrates has a double meaning, which would be appreciated by the audience, but would be unlikely to arouse suspicion in Hegio.

361. **Quae res bene uortat**, a common formula, e.g. *Aul.* 787 (at a betrothal) *quae res tibi et gnatae tuae Bene feliciterque uortat.* Cf. Virg. *Ecl.* ix. 6 *quod nec vertat bene.*

Vobisque, uolt te nouus erus operam dare
Tuo ueteri domino, quod is uelit, fideliter.
Nam ego te aestumatum huic dedi uiginti minis,
Hic autem te ait mittere hinc uelle ad patrem,
Meum ut illic redimat filium, mutatio
Inter me atque illum ut nostris fiat filiis.
PHIL. Vtroque uorsum rectumst ingenium meum
Ad te*d* atque illum: pro rota me uti licet:

---

362. Vobis quae *ante ras.* *V* herus V^2J **363.** ueteri *ex* uer- *B* **364.** estumatum *E* huic dedi aest. *Bothius* *fort.* aestumatum huic te minis *ex* minas *ras.* *B* **365.** mitte *D* **366.** HEG. *ante* mutatio B^1 *ut vid.* V^1E: *corr.* B^3 *ut vid.* V^2J mutacio *V* **368.** *versum laudat Priscianus inst.* xv *p.* 75, 22 H. (*testans* utroque uorsum) 'utroque—meum.' *Item* utroqueuorsum *hinc excerpsit gloss. Plaut. p.* 58, 3 *H.* Utroque (o *ex* u *ut vid.*) *D* rectumst *E*: rectum est *cett.* **369.** Ad te *ex* At te *BV*: *ex* Atque *D*: Ad te *EJ* atque ad illum *VE*

---

363. Velit. For the Subj. cf. v. 548, *Trin.* 715 *bene quod agas eueniat tibi*, Stich. 69 *pati Nos oportet quod ille faciat*, &c. **Fideliter.** For the position of the word cf. v. 455.

364. Huic appears to be occasionally a disyllable (spondee) in Plautus (see Introd. ii. § 6). In this line however the reading may require transposition. *Nam ego aestumatum huic te dedi* follows the usual order of the combination of Pers. Pron. in Oblique Case and Demonstrative. Bothe's *Nam ego te huic dedi aestumatum* (with a precedence of *te* which can be justified by the fact that *ego* is present, as in *Curc.* 208, &c.) is adopted by Brix.

365. Ait...uelle. The Inf. alone may be used in colloquial Latin, instead of the Acc. with Inf., after verbs of saying, when the subject is the same as that of the main verb (cf. v. 194).

367. Filiis, Abl. of Instrument.

368. Rectum, Partic., as in *Bacch.* 412 *ego illum haberem rectum ad ingenium bonum.*

369. Ad ted atque illum. In one MS. (*E*) the Preposition is repeated before *illum*, but this is an insertion for which the scribe of this MS. alone is responsible. The common original of our MSS. had *ad te atque illum* (cf. v. 367 *inter me atque illum*), and the defective metre can be more simply remedied by restoring the old form *ted* than by adding a new word *ad*. Exactly the same case occurs in *Truc.* 47, where the MSS. offer:

Bis perit amator ab re atque animo simul,

and where the metre requires either *red*, the old Abl. form (Introd. ii. § 5),

Vel ego huc uel illuc uortar, quo imperabitis.
HEG. Tute tibi [ea] tuopte ingenio prodes plurumum,

---

370. uortar uortar *D* quod *E* imperabis *D*: impeabitis V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* 371. Tute *ex* Teute *E* *del.* ea *Fleckeisenus, C. F. Hermannus*: *transp. ante* ferri (*v.* 372) *Schoellius* prode V^2J plurimum *VJ*

---

or <*ab*> *animo*. And an editor of Plautus is often confronted with the difficulty of deciding whether a Preposition has been wrongly repeated by one MS. or wrongly omitted by another, e.g.:

> *Mil.* 607 Séd speculabor néquis aut hinc aut ab laeua aut [a] dextera (a AP^{CD}, *om.* B),

where the retention of *a* involves the scansion *nĕquis* (see Introd. ii. § 13). In *Rud.* 29 the repeated Preposition is omitted by *B*, but retained by P^{CD}:

> Quique aétatem agitis cúm pietate et cúm fide,

while in *Poen.* 293 (where it is not required by the metre) it is omitted by P^{CD} but retained by *B* and *A*:

> Cúrram igitur aliquo ád piscinam aut ád lacum, limúm petam,

and in *Rud.* 1170, a line quoted by Priscian, it is omitted by *C* and by the MSS. of Priscian, but retained by *B* and *D*:

> *A.* Súcula. *B.* Quin tu i díerecta cúm sucula et cum pórculis.

A scribe would, I fancy, be more liable to omit a Preposition when it was repeated than to insert a Preposition when it did not stand in his original; and in this line the liability would be increased by the neighbouring *Inter me atque illum.* Still the fact remains that the second *ad* apparently did not stand in the original of our MSS. and is required neither by the metre nor by the grammatical usage of Plautus.

Rota. Some understand 'hoop' (*trochus* of Hor. *C.* III. xxiv. 57: *Graeco seu iubeas trocho Ludere*), others 'potter's wheel' (*rota figularis* of *Epid.* 371 *uorsutior es quam rota figularis*). But the wheel of a carriage may equally be referred to. There is the same difficulty about *rotula* in *Pers.* 443:

> Mirum, qum citius iam a foro argentarii
> Abeunt, quam in cursu rotula circumuortitur.

371. Cf. v. 199 and *Cist.* 741 *tu* (*tua* MSS.) *tibi nunc prodes.* **Tute tibi** seems in the dialogue of Plautus to have the ictus *tuté tibi*, and was probably pronounced like a four-syllabled word with accent on the second syllable, e.g. *Curc.* 9 *Tute tibi puer es, lautus luces cereum* (with *luceo* in its old Causative sense). The retention of *ea* (Neut. Pl.), which is hardly possible from grammatical reasons (cf. *Trin.* 35 *id quod prosint pluribus*), would require the unlikely scansion *Tut(e) tib(i) ea* (see note on following line). *Tute* is separated from *tibi* in *Pseud.* 20 *Cape has tabellas, tute hinc*

[redacted]

Cum seruitutem ita fers ut <eam> ferri decet.
Sequere. Em tibi hominem. TYND. Gratiam habeo tibi
Quom copiam istam mi et potestatem facis,
Vt ego ad parentes hunc remittam nuntium,
Qui me quid rerum hic agitem et quid fieri uelim

---

372. fers ita *Pylades* uti *Camerarius* <eam> *Schoellius* (*cf. v.* 371) 373. Sequaere *E* hem V^2J gratias *Guietus, Bothius* 374. Cum *J* cupiam *D* mihi *libri* (michi *J*) 375. parentes meos hunc *B* nuncium *J* 376. hic *om. E*

---

narrato tibi. **Prodes plurumum.** *Men.* 359 *Qui mi est usui et plurimum prodest.*

372. **Cum...fers.** See note on v. 151. The scansions *itā*, *benĕ*, *malĕ* are scarcely conceivable in Bacchiac or Cretic Metre (Introd. ii. § 16), much less in Iambic or Trochaic, nor does a Hiatus like *seruitutem* | *ita* seem to be permissible (Introd. ii. § 37). The various insertions that have been proposed, <*tu*> *ita*, <*istam*> *ita*, &c., are equally satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Schoell's <*eam*> *ferri* supposes the missing word to have been written above the line in some Archetype, and to have found its way into the preceding line, where our MSS. have the puzzling insertion *tibi* [*ea*] *tuopte.* Precisely the same thing happened in vv. 58—59, where *esse* of v. 59, suprascript in *P*, found its way into v. 58 in P^{BD}. But an equally simple remedy would be to give *ut* its O. Lat. form *uti*, for this older form is over and over again 'modernized' in our MSS. Another would be to transpose *fers ita.* The true reading is quite uncertain.

373. **Sequere,** to Philocrates. **Em tibi hominem,** to Tyndarus. **Gratiam habeo tibi.** The Hiatus in the word-group *gratiam-habeo* seems permissible on the analogy of a word-group (or Compound Verb) like *circum-imus* (*Men.* 231 *An quási mare omnis círcumimus ínsulas?*). The phrase recurs with this scansion in *Mil.* 1425 A. *Ópsecro uos.* B. *Sóluite istunc.* A. *Grátiam habeó tibi*, where the reading is established by the agreement of the Ambrosian with the Palatine recension. We find also *gratias habeo*, e.g. *Poen.* 1274 *uobis habeo merito magnas gratias*, Asin. 545, *Trin.* 659 *Et tibi nunc, proinde ut merere, summas habeo gratias*, 821 (cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 894, *Andr.* 770), for class. *gratiam habeo* (but *gratias ago*); and some editors would read *gratias* instead of *gratiam* both in this line and in the line of the *Miles* just quoted.

374. **Quom...facis** (cf. ad v. 151). **Istam,** i.e. *de qua* (or *earum rerum de quibus*) *dixisti* (vv. 342—3), as in *Trin.* 567 *de istoc, quod dixti modo*, Trin. 655 *omnia ego istaec, quae tu dixti, scio*, Rud. 563 *ubi istaec sunt, quas memoras, mulieres*, &c.

376. **Me quid...agitem...perferat.** See note on v. 557. **Quid**

Patri meo, ordine omnem rem, illuc perferat.
Nunc ita conuenit inter me atque hunc, Tyndare,
Vt te aestumatum in Alidem mittam ad patrem,
Si non rebitas huc, ut uiginti minas
Dem pro te. PHIL. Recte conuenisse sentio.
Nam pater expectat aut me aut aliquem nuntium,
Qui hinc ad se ueniat. TYND. Ergo animum aduortas uolo.
Quae nuntiare hinc te uolo in patriam ad patrem.
PHIL. Philocrates, ut adhuc locorum feci, faciam sedulo

---

377. ordinem (*del.* m) *E* rem *om.* B^1 (*add.* B^2) 378. tindare *J* 379. estimatum *DVE* 380. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 509 (*s.v.* rebitare) 'si non rebitas—pro te' rebitas *libri*: redeas *in marg.* B^3: reuertas V^2 huic *Lomanus Spec. crit. p.* 3 381. ppote (*sic*) *D* PH. *om.* V^1 (*add.* V^2) *E* 383. Quin *E* ego *VE* 385. PHIL. *praem.* ς: *inter* Philocrates *et* ut BEV^1 (*del.* V^2): *om. D* (*J n. l.*) adhoc *ex* adhuc *V* fatiam *V*

---

rerum, a common phrase in colloquial Latin. Cf. Catull. xxviii. 4 *Quid rerum geritis?* **Agitem.** On the colloquial Latin use of Frequentatives see note on v. 83.

377. **Ordine,** 'in detail,' a frequent use of the word. *In* is prefixed in *Poen.* 590, *Pseud.* 676, according to the united testimony of the two families of MSS.

380. **Rebitas.** The O. Lat. verb *baeto*, 'I go,' became in Composition *-bīto* as *quaero* became *-quīro*, and *caedo*, *-cīdo*. Through false analogy of its Compounds it came to be written *bito* (cf. *spicio* for *specio*, *cludo* for *claudo*); and this is the spelling which the Simple Verb bears in our MSS. of Plautus (*Curc.* 141, *Merc.* 465, *Mil.* 997; cf. *Pseud.* 254). Whether alone or in composition *baeto* (*bito*) is frequently changed by scribes to forms of *eo*, *ābitat* becoming *abeat*, &c. *Rebito* recurs in vv. 409, 696, 747, and another Compound which appears in this play is *adbito* v. 604.

382. **Pater,** 'your father,' as in v. 400, while in vv. 379, 384, 389, 395, 406, 440 it has the more usual sense 'my father.' The ambiguity is no doubt designed by Plautus. We need not therefore assign the line to Tyndarus, as Madvig (*Advers. Crit.* II. p. 6) proposed to do.

383. **Ergo,** as in vv. 423, 721, 1020, &c.

385. **Adhuc locorum.** The Gen. Pl. occurs again in *post id locorum* *Cas.* 120, *Poen.* 144, *Truc.* 661, a phrase used by Sallust (*Jug.* 72, 2), along with *ad id locorum* (*Jug.* 63, 6; cf. Liv. ix. 45, 2; xxii. 38, 12, &c.). The Gen. Sg. *loci* is more frequent in this Adverbial use.

Vt potissimum quod in rem recte conducat tuam,
†Id petam id persequarque corde et animo atque auribus.
TYND. Facis ita ut te facere oportet. Nunc animum aduortas uolo.
Omnium primum salutem dicito matri et patri
Et cognatis et si quem alium beneuolentem uideris;
Me hic ualere et seruitutem seruire huic homini optumo,
Qui me honore honestiorem semper fecit et facit.
PHIL. Istuc ne praecipias, facile memoria memini tamen.

---

386. potissimum] *J n. l.* tuam *B*[3] *ut vid. J*: tuum *B*[1]*DVE* 387. Id petam idque persequar *Camerarius*, Id petam <que> id persequarque *Niemeyerus* uiribus *J* 389. matri ex patri *E* 390. cagnatis *E* si *om. VEJ* 391. optimo *V* 392. honore honestiorem *ex* honestiorem honore *E* fecit et semper *Wilamowitzius* 393. PHIL. *om. B*[1] (*add. B*[3]) *V*[1] (*add. V*[2]) *E* non *VE* (*J n. l.*) precias *B*[1] (*corr. B*[2]): precipias *DV* memini (*ex* -nit) tamen *B*: meminit ameñ *D*: meminit amen *V*[1]*E*: memini TYND. (TIN., TIND.) tamen *V*[2]*J*

---

387. The change of the reading of the MSS. (*id petam id persequarque*) to *id petam idque persequar* involves the further change of *auribus* (the word that stood in the common original of our MSS.) to *uiribus*, and *córde et ánimo atque aúribus* sounds Plautine. Until better evidence is produced for the postponement of *que* we must reject Niemeyer's emendation *id petamque id persequarque.* Perhaps the first *id* is a corruption of *ut*.

388. **Facis ita ut te facere oportet.** Cf. vv. 294, 440. In Terence *facis ut te decet* (*Andr.* 421, *Haut.* 1054).

389. **Dicito.** See note on v. 114.

391. **Seruitutem seruire.** See note on v. 544.

392. **Honore honestiorem...fecit.** Cf. *honore honestes* vv. 247 (see note), 356. Tyrrell would print *Honore*, on the type of *Cist.* 644 *O Salute mea salus salubrior!*, Asin. 268 *illos lubentiores faciam quam Lubentiast.* Tyndarus perhaps utters the words here so as to convey a sly allusion to Hegio's mistaking him for Philocrates. Langen (*Plaut. Stud.* p. 274) is too critical in objecting to *semper fecit* on the ground that the honouring began only at v. 356 *Cum me tanto honore honestas cumque ex uinclis eximis.* Tyndarus is affecting a grandiloquent tone that does not allow strict accuracy of expression.

393. **Memoria memini.** See note on v. 250. **Tamen.** See note on v. 404.

TYND. Nam equidem, nisi quod custodem habeo, liberum me esse arbitror.
Dicito patri quo pacto mihi cum hoc conuenerit
De huius filio. PHIL. Quae memini, mora mera est monerier.
TYND. Vt eum redimat et remittat nostrum huc amborum uicem.
PHIL. Meminero. HEG. At quam primum pote: istuc in rem utriquest maxume.

---

394. TYND. *add.* B^3: *om. cett.* quidem *libri*: *corr. Lambinus* nisi E^3 (*rec.*) *in ras.* 395. cum hoc mihi *Pylades* 396. moram *DV* me est *J* 397. TYND. *add.* B^3: *om. cett.* redimat (a *ex* o *ut vid.*) *B* 398. PHIL. *add.* B^3: *om. cett.* HEG. B^3 *in ras.* V^2J: TYND. *cett.* poteris *libri*: *corr. Spengelius Philol.* XXXVII *p.* 435 utrique est BV^2J maxume *J*: -ime *ceteri*

---

394. **Nam equidem** (cf. ad v. 249). The use of *equidem* in this formula is so frequent in Plautus that we may venture to change the *quidem* of the MSS. here. (Similarly in *Pseud.* 620 *nam equidem* of *BD* has become *nam quidem* in *C.*) **Nisi quod.** See note on v. 621.

395. **Cum hoc** with Hiatus (see note on v. 24). There seems no need to transpose *cum hoc mihi* or to adopt the suggestion of Brix *cum hoc* <*hoc*>.

396. See note on v. 191 *memorem mones.* **Mera.** So *segnities mera* Trin. 795 (*in huius modi negotio Diem sermone terere segnities merast*); *nugae merae* Curc. 199, *Poen.* 348; *damnum merum* Curc. 49, and so on.

397. **Vt.** See note on v. 920. **Vicem** also takes a Possessive Pronoun in Plautus, e.g. v. 526, *Truc.* 158 *et nostram et illorum uicem.* But there is no need to change *nostrum* here.

398. **Pote** is properly the Neuter of *potis*, e.g. *pote est* (class. *potest*), 'it is possible,' often used without the Substantive Verb. From this usage arose the phrase *ut pote*, lit. 'as (far as) is possible,' e.g. *Mil.* 529:

> Pro di inmortales, similiorem mulierem
> Magisque eandem ut póte quae non sit eadem, non reor
> Deos facere posse,

whence in class. Lat. *utpote qui*, like *quippe qui.* The ante-classical *potis*, *pote*, being unfamiliar to scribes, have often been changed to a more familiar word in our MSS. (see note on v. 89). Here *pote* has become *poteris.* **Vtrique.** *In rem* is joined to the Genitive of a Noun in Plautus (*Pers.* 342 *in uentris rem uidebitur*) and Terence (*Hec.* 102 *in rem*

PHIL. Non tuum tu magis uidere quam ille suum gnatum cupit.
HEG. Meus mihi, suus cuique est carus. PHIL. Numquid aliud uis patri
Nuntiari? TYND. Me hic ualere et (tute audacter dicito,
Tyndare) inter nos fuisse ingenio haud discordabili,

---

399. PHIL. B^3V^2: *om. cett.* (*J n. l.*) tuum] *J n. l.* suum *s. v. J* cupit *ex* capit *V* 400. HEG. B^3V^2: *om. cett.* (*J n. l.*) michi *J* nunquid *J* patri *s. v. D* 400—555. *leguntur in cod. Ottoboniano* (*O*) 400—406. *hos versus his vocabulis concludunt libri*, nuntiari, fuisse, culpam, morem, deseruisse te: *corr. Pylades* 401. nunciare B^1: nunciari B^3J 402. tindare *DVE* Inter *B* (I- B^3) haut *E*

---

est Bacchidis), or (the usual construction) to a Possessive Pronoun, e.g. *in rem meam*, *tuam*, &c. (cf. v. 386). The Pronoun *uterque* appears in this connexion as *utrique* (*Aul.* 129 *quod in rem esse utrique arbitremur*, Ter. *Andr.* 546 *Si in remst utrique ut fiant*), which suggests that *-i* is an old ending of the Genitive case of the Pronoun, an ending of which we have various traces, more or less certain, in the early literature (see note on v. 471). The phrases *e re*, *ab re* take the same construction as *in rem*, the Gen. of a Noun being found in *Asin.* 224 *haud est ab red aucupis*. The Pronoun *iste* appears as *istius* in the MSS. of Ter. *Phorm.* 969 *Non hércle ex re istius me instigasti, Demipho*, but the metre requires a disyllable (see Introd. ii. § 15). There is stronger evidence however for a Gen. ending *-i* in Pronouns like *uterque*, *alius*, &c. than in Demonstrative Pronouns. It is conceivable that the words *At quam...maxime* are spoken by Tyndarus, in which case *utrique* would convey a different significance to Philocrates than to Hegio. That Philocrates should address his next remark to Hegio would be natural enough. The distribution of the speakers in this Scene in our MSS. does not always seem to rest on ancient authority.

400. **Patri.** We have also *ad patrem* &c. (so vv. 360, 384) with *nuntiare*, e.g. *Bacch.* 391 *ut seruos meus mi nuntiauit Chrysalus*, Truc. 702 *Ita ad me magna nuntiauit Cyamus hodie gaudia.*

401. The line is perfectly right as it stands. Tyndarus is casting about in his mind for some equivocal form of message and repeats the *me hic ualere* of v. 391 to gain time. **Audacter dicito.** *Most.* 916, *Pseud.* 828; cf. *Epid.* 16, *Merc.* 726, *Men.* prol. 52.

402. **Fuisse.** The omission of the Subject (here *nos*) is common enough in Plautus (cf. v. 420, and see note on v. 365). But it is somewhat awkward here, where there is already a Subject, *me*.

Neque te commeruisse culpam (neque me aduersatum tibi)
Beneque ero gessisse morem in tantis aerumnis tamen;
Neque med umquam deseruisse te neque factis neque fide,
Rebus in dubiis, egenis. Haec pater quando sciet,
Tyndare, ut fueris animatus erga suum gnatum atque se,
Numquam erit tam auarus, quin te grat*ii*s emittat manu;

---

403. te aduorsatum mihi *Brixius* 404. beneque (que *postea ins.*) B hero V^2J gessisse morem B^3V^2J: gesiss amorem B^1: gessis amorem DV^1E erumnis *libri* (erumpnis J) 405. me VEJ 406. egenis (i *ex* u) E 407. Tindare DVE: Tyndare *ex* Tyd- O 408. Nunquam D qui in te V^1 (*corr.* V^2) E gratus *libri* (gratis OJ) emitat V: emittat *ex* mittat E gratiis quin te emittat manu *Schoellius*, quin te manu emittat gratiis *Brixius*

---

403. **Commeruisse culpam,** the usual phrase. *Commereo* is used in a bad, *promereo* in a good sense. Cf. Donatus ad Ter. *Ad.* ii. 1. 47 (200) *bene promeruit*] '*Promeruit,*' *adiuuit, profuit, cui contrarium est* '*commeruit.*'

404. **Tamen** often stands, as here, at the end of the line. Cf. vv. 187, 393 of this play.

405. **Med...te.** The equivocal use of the two Accusatives (cf. the oracle in Ennius *Ann.* 181 M. *Aio te, Aeacida, Romanos uincere posse*) is of course intentional.

406. **Rebus in dubiis, egenis.** For the Asyndeton see note on v. 718. The phrase recurs in *Poen.* 130:

Saepe ego res multas tibi mandaui, Milphio,
Dubias, egenas, inopiosas consili.
Quas tu sapienter, docte et cordate et cate
Mihi reddidisti opiparas opera tua.

407. **Vt fueris animatus,** a common expression. Cf. *Trin.* 698 *Scio equidem te animatus ut sis.* **Atque,** here disyllabic, though before an initial consonant (see Introd. ii. § 14).

408. **Numquam erit tam.** Acc. *Trag.* 337 R. *Numquam erit tam inmanis.* This is a common colloquial use of *numquam* (often *numquam hodie*). Cf. Donatus ad Ter. *Andr.* II. iii. 10 '*Numquam*' *plus habet negationis quam* '*non.*' **Gratiis,** always a trisyllable, as *ingratiis*, a quadrisyllable, in the Dramatists. It is the Abl. of *gratiae*, 'for mere thanks' (cf. Ter. *Ad.* 744 *si non pretio, at gratiis*). *Gratus* of the MSS. is not attractive, and the change to *gratiis* is unobjectionable, since *u*

Et mea opera, si hinc rebito, faciam ut faciat facilius.
Nam tua opera et comitate et uirtute et sapientia
Fecisti ut redire liceat ad parentis denuo,
Cum apud hunc confessus es et genus et diuitias meas:
Quo pacto emisisti e uinclis tuum erum tua sapientia.
PHIL. Feci ego ita ut commemoras, et te meminisse id
gratum est mihi.

---

409. fatiam *VE* 410. sapientia (a *ex* or *ut vid.*) *B* 412. es (e *ex* i) *D*: es *ex* est *ras. O* diuicias *B*: diuitias *ex* diutias *O* 413. exemisti *Lambinus 'unius libri vet. auctoritatem secutus'* uinculis *libri* herum V^2JO 414. Fecisti *ut vid. J* ista *libri* (*ex* istas *V*): *corr. Bothius, Schmidtius de pron. p.* 78 commemoras (e *ex* o *ut vid.*) *B*: cmemoras *E* michi *J*

---

is over and over again confused with *ii* by scribes (cf. *ingratus* P^E for *ingratiis*, Curc. 6). To improve the rhythm various transpositions have been suggested, *gratiis quin te emittat manu*, by Schoell, which is a legitimate transposition, but does not effect much improvement; *quin te mănŭ emittat gratiis*, by Brix (cf. *Curc.* 497 *mănŭ emittitis*, *Pers.* 483), which interferes too violently with the reading of the MSS. For the Cretic, scanned as a Dactyl, in the 5th foot of a Trochaic Septenarius, cf. v. 840. **Emittat manu.** For class. *manumittere* Plautus uses *manu emittere* (e.g. v. 713).

409. Cf. Pompon. *Com.* 92 R. *Euannetur; et mea ocius opera ut fiat fecero.* **Rebito.** On the Verb, see note on v. 380, and on the Tense, on v. 6.

411. **Redire...denuo.** Pleonastic expressions of this kind are common in the Dramatists. Cf. v. 767 *redauspicandum denuo*, Ter. *Hec.* prol. ii. 30 (quoted on p. 116) *refero denuo.*

413. Lambinus appears to have had a collation of the Codex Turnebi (*T*), but it is doubtful whether he took the reading *exemisti* from this source. We have the phrase *e vinclis eximere* in vv. 204, 356, where Hegio is the subject; and it is quite possible that in some Renaissance copy the word *exemisti* was substituted here for *emisisti* on the strength of these passages. Here, where it is a slave who is spoken of as effecting the release of his master, *emittere ex vinclis* may be a more suitable phrase. Niemeyer suggests that *emisisti* may be used with reference to *emittat manu* v. 408.

414. **Ita.** The MSS. have *ista* (cf. *Cas.* 996 *feci ego istaec dicta quae uos dicitis*), a form which appears to be not Plautine (see note on v. 964). With *id* in this line, it cannot be said that *ista* is required by *ea* of v. 415. In *Trin.* 1170 *ita* has similarly become *ista* in the MSS.

Merito tibi ea euenerunt a me; nam nunc, Philocrates,
Si ego item memorem quae me erga multa fecisti bene,
Nox diem adimat; nam quasi seruus [meus] esses, nihilo setius
<Tu> mihi obsequiosus semper fuisti. HEG. Di uostram fidem,
Hominum ingenium liberale! Vt lacrumas excutiunt mihi!

---

415. phylocrates *J* 416. erga me *D* 417. nam si *libri* (si *s. v. O*): *corr. Fleckeisenus* meus *del. Guietus* mi esses *Bentleius*, meus sis *Fleckeisenus* nichilo *J* setius DV^2JO: se tuis V^1E: secius *B* 418—421. *hos versus vocabulis* ingenium, corde, seruus, partem *claudunt libri* (*sed* Videas *D*): *corr. Pylades* 418. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 530 'mihi—fuisti' <Tu> *Fleckeisenus, Ussingius* Michi *EJ* dii *JO* uestram (ūram) *libri* (uostram *JO*) 419. lacrimas *VEJ* excuciunt *V* michi *EJ*

---

416. Whether the change of *me* to *med* is an improvement is doubtful: *s(i) égo item memorem quaé med erga*, &c. If we retain *me*, there will be Hiatus after *si* (see Introd. ii. § 40). **Si ego...memorem.** Ter. *Hec.* 471 *idque si nunc memorare hic uelim, Quam fideli animo et benigno in illam et clementer fui, Vere possum.* Plautus greatly affects the verb *memoro*, a rare word in Terence. In this play alone it occurs in vv. 270, 552, 573, 577, 906, 929, 981, 983.

417. The scansion of *meus esses* as *meu'sses* on the type of *meust* for *meus est* seems to me very questionable (see Introd. ii. § 12). Bentley proposed *mi esses*, Fleckeisen *meus sis*; Guyet removed *meus* as a gloss. The reading of this and the following line is doubtful.

418. **Obsequiosus.** Cicero (ap. Quint. *Inst. Or.* VIII. iii. 35) declared *obsequium* to have been a coinage of Terence. Donatus, in his note on Ter. *Andr.* I. i. 41 (68), corrects this statement, and says that the word was used by Naevius as well as Plautus. The Noun occurs in *Bacch.* 1082:

> Ego dare me meo gnato institui ut animo obsequium sumere possit.

Di uostram fidem, '*admirantis adverbium cum exclamatione*,' Donatus ad Ter. *Andr.* IV. iii. 1 (716). In *Cist.* 663 we have the full phrase: *di, obsecro uostram fidem.*

419. **Vt lacrumas excutiunt mihi.** *Cist.* 112 *Ut mi exciuisti lacrumas!*, Ter. *Haut.* 167 *lacrumas excussit mihi.*

[redacted]

Videas corde amare inter se. Quantis <seruum> laudibus,
Suum erum seruus collaudauit. PHIL. Pol istic me haud centessimam
Partem laudat quam ipse meritust ut laudetur laudibus.
HEG. Ergo cum optume fecisti, nunc adest occasio
Bene facta cumulare, ut erga hunc rem geras fideliter.

---

420. <seruum> *supplevi*, <lautus> l. *Leo* laudibus B^2 *in ras.*: laudauit *cett.* (B^1 *n. l.*) 421. suum *ex* se- *J* herum V^2JO *post* herum *ras.* 1—2 *litt. J* Colladauit *E* TYND. *Fleckeisenus* haud *ex* haut *B* centessimam *J*: oentesimam *ex* centessimam *O*: centesimam *ceteri* 422. meritus est *libri* ut E^3 (*rec.*) *ex corr.*: uel V^1 (*corr.* V^2) laudibus *ex* laudabilis *D* 423. optune *J* 424. cumilare *E*

---

420. **Corde amare.** *Truc.* 177 *neminem mage amat corde atque animo suo.* Cf. Enn. *A.* 41 M. *corde cupitus.* **Laudibus.** This is the reading of the corrector (B^2) of the Codex Vetus, and, since his corrections are usually of great value, should probably be accepted. Leo supplies the defect in the line by inserting *lautus* before *laudibus*, and compares a Plautine fragment (*Paras. Piger* 3):

Ambo magna laude lauti, postremo ambo sumus non nauci.

But the fragment is so scanty that we cannot be sure of the exact sense of *lauti.* The version *quantis <seruum> laudibus, Suum erum seruus collaudauit* is supported by the fact that it is Philocrates who replies. At least the MSS. assign *Pol istic* &c. to Philocrates, though Fleckeisen makes Tyndarus the speaker.

421. **Haud.** Although *hau* appears often before an initial consonant in our MSS. it is unwise to print this form where the MSS. do not show it. The spelling may not have been subject to strict law. This negative is appropriate to expressions of one's opinion, 'not in my opinion.' Cf. v. 209. **Haud centessimam partem.** Cf. *Mil.* 763 *haud centesimam Partem dixi atque...possum exprimere.* The phrase is here used adverbially like *magnam partem, maiorem partem, maximam partem,* indeed like the Adverb *partim* itself, which was originally Acc. Sing. of *pars.* **Quam,** because *haud centesimam partem* is the equivalent of *multo minus.*

422. **Meritust ut,** as in v. 744 &c.

423. **Cum...fecisti.** See note on v. 151.

424. **Occasio...cumulare.** The Inf. after *occasio* is common in Plautus, e.g. *Pers.* 725 *nunc est illa occasio Inimicum ulcisci.* We have also the Gen. of the Gerund, e.g. v. 117 above, *fugiendi...occasio.* Terence unites the two constructions in *Phorm.* 885:

PHIL. Magis non factum possum uelle, quam opera experiar persequi;
Id ut scias, Iouem supremum testem laudo, Hegio,
Me infidelem non futurum Philocrati. HEG. Probus es homo.
PHIL. Nec me secus umquam ei facturum quicquam quam memet mihi.
TYND. Istaec dicta te experiri et opera et factis uolo;

---

425. experiar *ex* eperiar *V* 426. *versum laudat Nonius p.* 335, 10 (*s. v.* laudare) 'id ut...egio' suppremum *BDVE* laudo *Nonius*: do *libri* egio *JO cum Nonio* 427. me *cum spat. init. BD* phyl- *J* 428. PHIL. *om.* BV^1 (*add.* V^2) *E* unquam *J* quicquam quam *BVE*: quicquam *D*: quam *J ut vid. O* 429. TYND. *om. libri* (*cf. v.* 430) Istec *BDEJ* experiri *ex* experire *B*: experi *VE* operis *B* *uolo *E*

Summa eludendi occasiost mihi nunc senes
Et Phaedriae curam adimere argentariam.

Bene facta cumulare. Cf. Cic. *magnum beneficium tuum magno cumulo auxeris.* **Vt geras**, 'by conducting,' a common use of *ut* in Plautus. Cf. v. 486.

425. **Magis...factum...uelle.** *Factum uolo* was a current phrase. **Opera**, 'in deed,' e.g. *Trin.* 826 *contra opera expertus.* Here *opera* is opposed to *voluntas* as in Ter. *Phorm.* 786 to *res*, 'money':

Pariter nunc opera me adiuues, ac re dudum opitulata's.

See note on v. 429 below.

426. **Laudo** is specially attested for this line by Nonius (335 M. 10): *laudare etiam significat nominare. Vergilius Georg. lib.* III.:

Aut inlaudati nescit Busiridis aras;

id est: nec nominandi. Plautus Captivis:

id ut scias, Iouem supremum testem laudo, Hegio.

(Cf. Gell. II. vi. 16 *'laudare' significat prisca lingua nominare appellareque; sic in actionibus civilibus auctor laudari dicitur, quod est nominari.*) Our MSS. of Plautus offer *do*, the usual expression (e.g. *Pseud.* 514 *do Iouem testem tibi*), which was probably a suprascript gloss. Schoell proposes *testem do, laudo, Hegio* (cf. ad v. 912); Langen *testem testor Hegio*, which is undoubtedly a Plautine phrase (cf. *Rud.* 1338 *Venus Cyrenensis, testem te testor mihi*). I do not see how we can refuse the direct testimony of Nonius. The hiatus before the Vocative *Hegio* may be legitimate (cf. v. 337).

428. **Nec...umquam...quicquam.** See note on v. 76.

429. **Experiri...opera.** The phrase *opera experiri* is common, e.g.

Et, quo minus dixi quam uolui de te, animum aduortas uolo,
Atque horunc uerborum causa caue tu mi iratus fuas;
Sed, te quaeso, cogitato hinc mea fide mitti domum
Te aestumatum, et meam esse uitam hic pro te positam pignori,

430. TYND. *praem. libri* (*cf. v.* 429) quod JO^2 (quo O^1) 431. horum *JO* caueto *libri*: *corr. Bothius, Bentleius* mihi *libri* (michi *J*) 432. Sette *ex* Set *E*: Sete *J* queso *libri* (quaeso *J*) te mea *libri*: *del.* te *Camerarius* fidem V^1 (*corr.* V^2) mitti *ex* mittit *V* 433. aestumatum *J*: estimatum *B ut vid.* (estuna-?) *DE*: aestimatum *V* uitam *ex* iiitam *ut vid. B*

Trin. 826 (quoted in note on v. 425), *Bacch.* 387. Here the plural *operis* might be used to suit the other plural *factis* (see note on v. 15 and cf. *Rud.* 321 *cum istiusmodi uirtutibus operisque natus qui sit*); but since *B* is alone in reading *operis*, the reading of the common original of our MSS. was in all probability *opera*. The Sing. is allowed by the metre, for hiatus at the Diaeresis of a Trochaic Septenarius is a common thing (Introd. iii. § 11).

430. **Quo minus**, 'the point in which (or rather, the amount by which) I failed' to utter all I had wished, as in Ter. *Andr.* 655:

Immo etiam, quo tu minus scis aerumnas meas,
Haec nuptiae non apparabantur mihi.

The *quod minus* of the MSS. in *Amph.* 479 is changed by editors to *quo minus*:

Nunc de Alcumena dudum quo[d] dixi minus,
Hodie illa pariet filios geminos duos.

Cf. Ter. *Eun.* 737.

431. The existence of a by-form of the Third Conj. *cavĕto* (unnecessarily posited by some editors for *Asin.* 372) is very unlikely. The P.P.P. *cautus* is no evidence for it, no more than *monitus* for a by-form *monĕto*. We must therefore suppose the scribe of some archetype to have made the common mistake of copying *cave tu* as *caveto*. *Caue* and *cau-* of *causa* would be pronounced similarly, as we see from Cicero's story about Crassus, at his departure for Parthia, mistaking the cry of a fig-seller, *Cauneas! Cauneas!* (sc. *ficus vendo*) for *cave ne eas* (*Div.* ii. 40. 84). **Fuas.** We have this form after *cave* in *Bacch.* 1033 *caue tibi ducenti nummi diuidiae fuant*, Pers. 51 *caue fuas mi in quaestione*. See note on v. 443.

432. **Cogitato.** See note on v. 711.

433. **Pignori.** The usual phrase is *pignori opponere*, e.g. *Pseud.* 87 *si me opponam pignori*, Ter. *Phorm.* 661 *ager oppositus pignori Ob decem minas est.*

Ne tu me ignores, qum extemplo meo e conspectu abscesseris,
Quom me seruom in seruitute pro ted hic reliqueris,
Tuque te pro libero esse ducas, pignus deseras
Nequè des operam pro me ut huius huc reducem facias filium ;
Scito te hinc minis uiginti aestumatum mittier.
Fac fidele sis fidelis, caue fidem fluxam geras ;

---

434. qum *BD*: cum *ex* q̃m (*ut vid.*) *ras.* *V*: quum *E*: cum *J* extemplo *B*, *sed* templ *in ras.* B^3 *ut vid.* abscesseris (a *confirmavit* B^3) *post* 2 *litt. ras.* *B* 435. Cum V^2J pro te *libri*: *corr. Bothius* 436. ducas *om.* *VEJ* deseras B^3 *in marg.*: desideras *cett.* 437. Atque V^2: Atquae *J* huius huius BDV^1: huius V^2EJ: *correxi* fatias *E* 438. *secl. Brixius* Scio V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* hinc *om.* *E*: hic *J* minis *ex* nimis *V* aestumatum *J*: estumatum *ceteri* mittier *ex* mitier *D*: mitier *VE* 439. *versum laudat Nonius p.* 512, 29 (*s. v.* fidele pro fideliter) 'fac fidele caue fidem fluxam feras' fidelis sis fideli *libri*: fidele *Nonius* cauae *V* feras *Nonius* (referas *Harl.*[1])

---

434. **Qum.** See note on v. 143. **Q. extemplo.** See note on v. 786.

436. We have already had a similar Asyndeton in vv. 80—81. Two Verbs which depend on a Conjunction or a Relative may be used without a connecting particle if the second denotes either some antithesis to the first or some continuation or development of the thought or action, e.g. *Bacch.* 35 *ut tu taceas, ego loquar*, Rud. 774 *ut illas serues, uim defendas*, Amph. 1061 *ubi parturit, deos sibi inuocat.*

437. **Huius huc.** This correction of *huius huius* of the MSS. (which may be a mere case of Dittography) is suggested by v. 576 *Si huius huc reconciliasso in libertatem filium.*

438. Brix brackets this line, with reference to vv. 364, 378 sqq., 432. To me it seems that Tyndarus is prolonging the leave-taking as much as he can, and that his reiteration of what he had said before, as well as his unconnected, disordered sentences, are quite in the style of leave-takings in actual life. He labours to impress Philocrates who will soon be beyond call. *Scito* however must not be translated as if it were *memento.*

439. Nonius expressly attests the Adverb *fidele* (cf. *facile*) for this line (512 M. 29): Fidele pro fideliter. Plautus Captivis :

fac fidele <sis fidelis> caue fidem fluxam feras.

I see no reason for disregarding his testimony (see note on v. 518). The reading of the MSS. of Plautus *fidelis sis fideli* is somewhat more easily derived from an original *fidelis sis fidele* than from *fidele sis fidelis.* But in

Nam pater, scio, faciet quae illum facere oportet omnia.
Serua tibi in perpetuum amicum me, atque hunc inuentum inueni.
Haec per dexteram tuam te dextera retinens manu
Opsecro, infidelior mihi ne fuas quam ego sum tibi.

---

440. que *D* opotet *E* 441. Seruo J^1 (*corr.* J^2) imperpetuum *BDV* hunc *libri*: homo *E* 442. dextram *V* tua *J* 443. Opsecro *D*: Obsecro *cett.* ne *libri*: me *J*

---

the other phrases of the kind in Plautus the Adverb normally precedes its Adjective, e.g.:

Mil. 258 docte tibi illam perdoctam dabo.
Rud. 977 esne inpudenter inpudens?
Cist. 689 Illo sunt homines misere miseri.
Pseud. 13 Misere miser sum.
Aul. 314 mortalem parce parcum praedicas.
Cas. 522 nimium scite scitus es.

Fidem fluxam. Cf. Caecil. *Com.* 30 R. *Itane Antipho inuenitur profluia fide? Itanest inmemoris, itanest madida memoria?* The word *fluxus* does not occur elsewhere in Plautus. But it was used by the Tragedian Accius (*Trag.* 601 R. *quae ego cuncta esse fluxa in mea re crepera comperi*). We have the phrase *fides fluxa* in Sallust *Jug.* 111. 2; Livy xl. 50. 5. **Geras.** Whether this, the reading of our MSS. of Plautus, or *feras*, the reading of the MSS. of Nonius, is to be preferred, is uncertain.

440. **Scio**, parenthetic, occurs elsewhere without metrical ictus, e.g. *Merc.* 726 A. *Scio, innóxiu's.* B. *Audácter quamuis dícito.* It may have had, at least occasionally, quite subordinate stress in the pronunciation of the sentence. **Faciet quae illum facere oportet.** Cf. ad v. 388.

441. **Hunc inuentum inueni.** Brix refers *hunc* to Hegio and quotes, as parallels to *inuentum inueni*, Men. 452 *contionem habere qui homines occupatos occupat*, Rud. 109 *qui oratione hic occupatos occupes*, Cic. *Fam.* XIV. i. 5 *vide ne puerum perditum perdamus.* It seems to me more likely that the words mean 'make this find,' i.e. discover Philopolemus, *inventum* being Acc. Sg. of the Verbal Noun *inventus* (cf. *factum* v. 352).

443. **Fuas.** This old Subjunctive is not rare in Plautus (e.g. v. 431). He uses *fors fuat an* for *forsitan*, e.g. *Pseud.* 432:

Fors fuat an istaec dicta sint mendacia.

It is also found in Terence (*Hec.* 610 *fors fuat pol*) and is an archaism of Virgil and others, e.g. *Aen.* x. 108:

Tros Rutulusne fuat nullo discrimine habebo.

Tu hoc age : tu mihi erus nunc es, tu patronus, tu pater;
Tibi commendo spes opesque meas. PHIL. Mandauisti satis.
Satin habes, mandata quae sunt facta si refero? TYND. Satis.
PHIL. Et tua et tua huc ornatus reueniam ex sententia.

---

444. herus V^2J nunc erus *Camerarius* 445. comendo *D* mandauisti *ex* -tis *E* 446. Satim V^1 (*corr. ras.*): Satui *E* refero (r *pri. ex* f) *J* TYND. *om.* V^1 (*add.* V^2) *E* 447. PHIL. B^3V^2J: *om. cett.* Et tua huc (*om.* et tua) *J cum O ut vid.* huc *ex* hoc *ut vid. J* reueueniam *J*

---

444. **Hoc age**, a common formula in calling attention (cf. v. 930). Plutarch (*Numa* 14, 4; *Coriol.* 25) tells us it was used by the herald to the people at a sacrifice. **Tu patronus, tu pater.** Ter. *Adel.* 455 *in te spes omnis nobis sitast; Te solum habemus, tu es patronus, tu pater*, Cas. 739 *Olympisce mi, mi pater, mi patrone* (master to slave), *Rud.* 1266 *Mi liberte, mi patrone potius, immo mi pater.* Cf. Cato ap. Gell. v. xiii. 4 *patrem primum, postea patronum proximum nomen habere.* The slaves in the *Asinaria* insist on getting the title of *patronus* before they consent to give their young master the money he is in need of (vv. 651 sqq., 689):

A. Sed tibi si uiginti minae argenti proferentur,
Quo nos uocabis nomine? *B.* Libertos. *A.* Non patronos?
B. Id potius.

We have a similar passage in the *Mostellaria* between the slave Tranio and his young master Philolaches (vv. 406—7):

PHIL. In tuam custodelam meque et meas spes trado, Tranio.
TRAN. Pluma haud interest, patronus an cliens probior siet.

The hiatus between *mihi* and *erus* may easily be removed by transposing *nunc erus.* But it may be legitimate (cf. ad v. 685, Introd. ii. § 40). Some scan *agē* (Introd. ii. § 33).

445. **Spes opesque**, a common combination, e.g. v. 517. (Cf. note on v. 15.)

446. **Satin habes...si.** This expression too is of frequent occurrence, e.g. *Most.* 389 *Satin habes, si ego aduenientem ita patrem faciam tuom, Non modo ne intro eat, uerum etiam ut fugiat longe ab aedibus?* Similarly *satin est* Bacch. 911 *Satin est si plura ex me audiet hodie mala?* **Mandata ...facta.** Cf. *Asin.* 913 *mandata dicam facta ut uoluerit.*

447. **Tua...tua.** The first would naturally be addressed to Tyndarus, the second to Hegio. **Ornatus**, i.e. accompanied by Philopolemus. See note on v. 997.

Numquid aliud? TYND. Vt quam primum possis redeas. PHIL. Res monet.
HEG. Sequere me, uiaticum ut dem a tarpezita tibi,
Eadem opera a praetore sumam syngraphum. TYND. Quem syngraphum?
HEG. Quem hic ferat secum ad legionem, hinc ire huic ut liceat domum.
Tu intro abi. TYND. Bene ambulato. PHIL. Bene uale.—HEG. Edepol rem meam
Constabiliui, cum illos emi de praeda a quaestoribus;

---

449. Sequere *ex* Sequare *B* trapezita *libri* (trapazaeta *J*: [tr]apazeta *O*) 450. pretore *BDVJ* sumam *D*: summam *B*: summa V^1E: summas V^2: sumas *J* singraphum *EJ* (*O n. l.*) singraphum *DVEO* 451. Quae V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* liceat (a *e corr.*) *D* 452. aedepol *D*: hedepol *V* 453. illo V^1E: illum V^2J preda *BD*: preda *cum* 3 *litt. sp. V*: praeda *cum* 6—7 *litt. sp. E* questoribus *libri*

---

448. **Numquid aliud?** This variation of the usual formula of leave-taking, *numquid vis?* (see note on v. 191) is not uncommon in Plautus (*Bacch.* 757, *Mil.* 259, 1195, *Most.* 404; cf. *Merc.* 282, *Poen.* 911). **Vt quam primum possis redeas.** Schoell assigns these words against the authority of the MSS. to Hegio, on the ground that the similar recommendation in v. 398 comes from Hegio. If any change is to be made, I should prefer to make the speaker in v. 398 Tyndarus. **Res monet.** *Asin.* 512.

449. **Tarpezita.** See note on v. 193.

450. **Eadem opera.** See note on v. 459. **Syngraphum,** 'passport.' The word is used in the sense of a written contract in *Asin.* 746 *Agedum istum ostende quem conscripsti syngraphum Inter me et amicam et lenam: leges pellege* (cf. ib. 802), for which in Cicero's time the more correct form *syngrapha* (Gk. *συγγραφή*) was in vogue. **Quem syngraphum?** Cf. 574, *Epid.* 571 A. *Ut matrem tuam uideas.* B. *Quam meam matrem?*, Ter. *Eun.* 823 A. *iste Chaerea.* B. *Qui Chaerea?* The word is repeated in the same case.

451. **Huic.** We should expect *ei.* But the repetition of *hic* is a mannerism of Plautus (see note on v. 738).

452. **Tu,** to Tyndarus, who leaves the stage by the door of Hegio's house at the remark of Philocrates, *bene uale.* **Bene ambulato** (*Epid.* 377, *Merc.* 327, *Pers.* 50), or *bene ambula* (*Capt.* 900, *Asin.* 108, *Cas.* 526, *Mil.* 936, *Most.* 853).

453. **Constabiliui.** Ter. *Adelph.* 771 *tuam rem constabilisses.* W

Expediui ex seruitute filium, si dis placet.
At etiam dubitaui, hos homines emerem an non emerem,
diu!
Seruate istum sultis intus, serui, ne quoquam pedem
Ecferat sine custode. Ego †apparebo domi;

---

454. displicet *E*: diis placet *JO* 455. etiam (ti *ex* u) *B* hosoe *Beckerus in Studem. Stud.* I *p.* 268 (*cf. Schmidtius de pron. dem. p.* 12, 88) *emerem an *J* non emere V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* 456. c. *velut nota personae in marg. J* stulti *ex* stultis *B* sitis V^2 *ante* pedem 1—2 *litt. eras. in J* 457. Efferat V^2*JO* ego <desubito> *Schoellius*

---

have another compound in Pacuvius (*Trag.* 324 R.): *Nam Teucrum regi* (*Teucro regnum* Grotius) *sapsa res restibiliet.* **Emi de praeda a quaestoribus.** See note on v. 34.

454. **Si dis placet.** So Ter. *Eun.* 919 *si dis placet, Spero me habere, qui hunc meo excruciem modo.* The phrase recurs in *Truc.* 647 with the sense of 'would you believe it?':

> Post illoc quam ueni, aduenit, si dis placet,
> Ad uillam argentum meo qui debebat pátri,

and in Ter. *Adelph.* 476 it has the ironical sense that it commonly bears in classical Latin:

> Ille bonus uir nobis psaltriam, si dis placet,
> Parauit, quicum uiuat, illam deserit.

455. **Hos.** I hesitate to change this to *hosce* against the MSS. Although it is certain that the Acc. and Dat. Abl. Pl. forms with the particle *-ce* were the normal forms in Plautus when the next word began with a vowel, there is strong evidence in the MSS. that this usage was not invariable. **Diu.** For the position of this word cf. v. 363 and see note on v. 404.

456. **Sultis,** for *si voltis*, is the Plur. of *sis*, for *si vis*, in which *v* disappeared between *ī-i*, as in *dīnus* for *divinus* (see note on v. 291), *obliscor* for *obliviscor*, *ditiae*, *ditior* for *divitiae*, *divitior*. We have the full form *si vis*, 'if you please,' in Afranius *Com.* 179 R.: *Mea nutrix, surge, si uis, profer purpuram.*

457. **Ecferat.** The Preposition *ex* (cf. Gk. ἐξ) took before the letter *f* in compounds the form *ec-* (cf. Gk. ἐκ), e.g. *ecfero*, *ecfari*. This spelling is censured by a Grammarian of the Empire (Ter. *Scaur.* 26. 14 K. *effatus, non 'exfatus' nec 'ecfatus,' ut quidam putaverunt*). In our MSS. it is often corrupted to *haec* or *et*. The form *ex* is also often corrupted to *et* through the similarity of the (minuscule) ligature *ex* to the ligature *et* (still retained in our symbol *&c.* 'etc.'), so that it is wrong to infer

[redacted]

Ad fratrem modo captiuos alios inuiso meos,
Eadem percontabor, ecquis hunc adolescentem nouerit.
Sequere tu, te ut amittam: ei rei primum praeuorti
uolo.—

458. captuos *E* <ad> c. *Muellerus* (*Rhein. Mus.* liv. 385) inuisu *DE* 459. Eadem *ex* Et andem *ut vid. E* percunotabor *libri* et quis *O* hunc *om. VEJO* 460. Sequaere *E*

(as many editors do) from the misspelling *et* in a MS. that the spelling in the archetype was *ec*-. It may have been *ex*. The ligature *ec*, it may be added, was also very similar to the ligatures *ex* and *et*, so similar that it was disused at an early stage in the history of minuscule script. **Pedem ecferat.** Cf. *Bacch.* 422 *Nego tibi hoc annis uiginti fuisse primis copiae Digitum longe a paedagogo pedem ut efferres aedibus*; Enn. *Trag.* 212 R. *Nam numquam era errans mea domo ecferret pedem.* **Apparebo domi.** *Poen.* 618 *Interibi attulerint exta, atque eadem mulieres Iam ab re diuina credo apparebunt domi.* How the line should be restored to metrical form is doubtful. The scansion *sinĕ* seems impossible; and the substitution of *nisi* (*nesi*) for *sine* has only the uncertain authority of a defective sentence in Festus (166. 26 Th.) *nesi pro sine positum....* It seems as if some Adverb should accompany *apparebo*. Schoell reads <*desubito*> *apparebo*, Niemeyer <*quam primum*> *apparebo*. Leo adopts Bothe's conjecture *custode*<*la iam*> *ego*, which is unsatisfactory, because *custodela* has always the sense of 'protection' in Plautus (*Merc.* 233, *Most.* 406, *Rud.* 625, 696).

458. **Inuiso.** *Stich.* 66 *Iam ego domi adero: ad meam maiorem filiam inuiso modo*; Men. 108 *nunc ad eum inuiso*; Pseud. 229 *cras...inuises pergulam.* See note on *viso*, v. 894. Müller's insertion of *ad* before *captivos* is supported by v. 126.

459. **Eadem**, with its equivalent *eadem opera* (v. 450), is used by Plautus of future actions only, e.g. v. 293, *Pers.* 444 *Abi istac trauorsis angiportis ad forum; Eadem istaec facito* (Fut. Imper.) *mulier ad me transeat.* *Eadem* is normally found with Asyndeton, though in *Poen.* 617 (quoted in note on v. 457), if the reading be right, we have *atque eadem.* (In *Stich.* 451 *eadem* P, *atque eadem* A.) *Eadem opera* has a Conjunction in *Bacch.* 60 *Tu prohibebis et eadem opera tuo sodali operam dabis*, Most. 1039 *Sume: eademque opera* <*ego*> *haec tibi narrauero.* **Ecquis** (with *siquis*, &c.) may have pyrrich scansion (Introd. ii. § 13). At the same time the dactyl in the fourth foot, *ĕcquĭs hŭnc* is not illegitimate (Introd. iii. § 17; cf. § 9).

460. **Ei rei**, normally two monosyllables in Plautus, as here. **Primum praeuorti.** *Mil.* 765 *Igitur id quod agitur,* <*ei*> *hic primum*

ERGASILVS parasitus. III. i.

Miser homo est, qui ipse sibi quod edit quaerit et id aegre inuenit,
Sed ille est miserior, qui et aegre quaerit et nihil inuenit;
Ille miserrimust, qui cum esse cupit, <tum> quod edit non habet.

III. i. PARASITVS DV (*om.* ERGASILVS) *libri* (*om.* DV *JO*) *unius v. sp. D* 461. iser *c. sp. in. DV*[1] (PAR. m *V*[2] *in marg.*) ipsus *Bothius* quae et id *V*[1] (*corr. V*[2]) *E* egre *BVE* 462. Set *E* egre *BVE*: aegre (r *ex* e) *D* querit *DVJ* nichil *E* 463. miserrimus est *libri* <tum> *Niemeyerus* aedit *V*: edat *JO*

---

praeuorti decet, Merc. 376 *Rei mandatae omnis sapientis primum praeuorti decet.* The Adverb is otiose (see note on v. 321). This use of *praeuortor* is common, e.g. v. 1026, *Cist.* 781 *Praeuorti hoc certumst rebus aliis omnibus.* Hegio leaves the stage by the right-hand door (p. 112), accompanied by Philocrates, in quest of the *praetor* (v. 450), from whom he is to get the passport.

Act III. Scene i. (Trochaic Septenarii.) Ergasilus enters by the right-hand door of the stage, having returned from the *forum* (v. 478), where he has sought in vain for a more attractive invitation to dinner than Hegio's. After a comical narration of his unhappy experiences, he leaves (by the left-hand door) for the harbour.

This scene, according to the tradition of the MSS., was a 'diverbium,' not a 'canticum,' i.e. was spoken without musical accompaniment.

461. **Ipse.** The form *ipsus* is normal in conjunction with the Reflexive Pronoun or Possessive Adj.; and perhaps *ipsus* is the original reading here, which has been changed to *ipse*, just as in *Trin.* 262 *fugat ipsus se a suo contutu*, the true form *ipsus*, preserved by the Ambrosian Palimpsest, has been changed in the Palatine MSS. to *ipse*. But there is evidence that *ipse* was occasionally used in this connexion, for it is required by the Metre in *Bacch.* 417 *Iam áderit tempus, cúm sese etiam ipse óderit: morém geras* (cf. v. 560 of this play). It is therefore perhaps safer to keep the reading of the MSS. here. For the rhythm *ipsé sibi* cf. *illé sibi* Stich. 24, etc.

462. **Est miserior qui...quaerit.** We find the Subj. in *Merc.* 700 *Miserior mulier me nec fiet, nec fuit, Tali uiro quae nupserim.*

463. **Ille miserrimust**, probably to be scanned *Íll(e) misérrimúst*, though a dactyl of the form *Ille mi-* would be tolerated in the first foot (Introd. iii. § 16). The scansion *misĕrrimust* is unnecessary here and is in itself extremely doubtful (Introd. ii. § 23). The defective metre of the line

Nam hercle ego huic die[i], si liceat, oculos effodiam lubens,
Ita malignitate onerauit omnes mortalis mihi;
Neque ieiuniosiorem neque magis ecfertum fame
Vidi, nec quoi minus procedat quicquid facere occeperit,
Ita uenter gutturque resident esuriales ferias.

464. ego *s. v. O.* diei *libri*: die *Bothius* lubens *JO*: libens *ceteri* 465. honerauit *DO*: honerauerit *J* mortales *VOJ* michi *EJ* 466. Nequae *J* nec *Bothius* ecfr tum V^1E: effractum V^2JO 467. qui BDV^1E: cui V^2 *ut vid. JO* 468. Itaque *libri*: *corr. Pylades*

seems to be most simply restored by Niemeyer's insertion of *tum*, since Bothe's *cupiit* is an abnormal form in Plautus, and *esse* <*se*> *cupit* (cf. *Most.* 61 *Nisi te mala re magna mactari cupis*) is unlikely.

464. **Nam,** 'I say this for,' as in v. 478 (where see note). **Die.** The Dat. Sg. ending of the Fifth Decl. was monosyllabic in Early Latin and probably in Classical Latin too, until the disyllabic Genitive ending came to be substituted for it (*rēī* Lucr. i. 687, ii. 235, *rēī*; Hor. *C.* iii. 24. 64). But that this monosyllabic ending had invariably the form *-ē* (*fide* Hor. *S.* i. 3. 95) is doubtful. There may have been also *-ī* (in archaic spelling *-eī*). We know from Aulus Gellius (second century A.D.) how persistently the scribes of the Empire effaced from their copies the antique forms of their originals; and in one chapter of the *Noctes Atticae* (ix. 14) he mentions two actual examples of the modernising of Fifth Declension forms (§ 2 *corruptos autem quosdam libros repperi in quibus 'faciei' scriptum est, illo, quod ante scriptum erat, oblitterato*, and again § 3), so that the form offered by our MSS. in this line, *diei*, may well have been substituted for an older *die* and not retain the archaic spelling of the other hypothetic ending in *-ī*. The disyllabic *-ei* of the Fifth Decl., like the disyllabic *-ai* of the First Decl., is in Plautus a Genitive, never a Dative, ending (see *Class. Rev.* x. 424). Ergasilus afterwards forms a vastly different opinion about the day (v. 774 *Ita hic me amoenitate amoena amoenus onerauit dies*).

466. **Ieiuniosiorem,** sc. *diem.* This unusual Adjective is formed from *jejunia*, as *inopiosus* Poen. 130 from *inopia*, &c. **Ecfertum fame,** like *inaniis oppletae* (*aedes*) Aul. 84. On the spelling of the Preposition see note on v. 457.

467. **Occeperit.** There is no need to write *occeperim* or *occeperis.* The day itself is humorously made the chief figure throughout the passage.

468. **Ita.** Some retain *itaque* of the MSS., giving it the pronunciation

Ilicet parasiticae arti maxumam malam crucem,
Ita iuuentus iam ridiculos inopesque ab se segregat.
Nihil morantur iam Lacones unisubselli uiros,
Plagipatidas, quibus sunt uerba sine penu et pecunia:

---

469. Licet *VEJO* maxumam *JO*: maximam *ceteri* **470.** radiculos *D* opesque *V*[1] *(corr. V*[2]*) E* que *del. Gulielmius Qu. in Capt. p.* 357 *ex ms. Lang.* sese *libri*: *corr. Camerarius* segragat *D ante corr.* **471.** Nichil *E* locones *O ante corr.* **472—9.** *O n.l.*

---

itac (see Introd. ii. § 14). It seems to me more likely that *itaque* is a scribe's mistake (left uncorrected) for *ita ue*(*nter*). **Resident...ferias**, cognate accusative. Cf. Cic. *Legg.* ii. 22. 55 *denicales feriae, quae a nece appellatae sunt quia residentur mortuis.* **Esuriales** is coined on the type of *denicales*, &c.

469. **Ilicet**, *scilicet*, *videlicet* often take in the older literature the construction of *ire licet* (cf. 90, *Pseud.* 1182), *scire licet*, *videre licet*, e.g. *Pseud.* 1179 *Scilicet solitum esse*, Asin. 599 *nunc enim esse Negotiosum interdius uidelicet Solonem* (cf. ad v. 283). **Malam crucem.** The Preposition *in* could be dispensed with in this and similar expressions after *ire*. Donatus in his note on Ter. *Eun.* 536 (*malam rem hinc ibis*) remarks: *hoc adverbialiter dixit, quemadmodum dicimus 'domum ibis.'* The word-group *malam crucem* is tantamount to a single quadrisyllabic word (hence capable of having the attributive adj. *maxumam*) and so does not violate the law that forbids two Iambic words to close an Iambic line (Introd. iii. § 8).

470. **Iuuentus.** Cf. v. 69. **Ridiculos**, i.e. *parasitos.* Cf. v. 477, *Stich.* 637 *Viden ridiculos nihili fieri, atque ipsos parasitarier?*

471. **Lacones.** Cf. Cic. *pro Mur.* 74 *Lacedaemonii...cotidianis epulis in robore accumbunt.* **Unisubselli uiros.** In *Stich.* 488 the parasite, seeking an invitation to dinner, says:

> Hau postulo equidem med in lecto accumbere;
> Scis tu med esse—unisubselli uirum,

where the consensus of *A* and *P* precludes the possibility of the change of *uni* to *imi.* (Besides, Plautus uses only *infimus*, never *imus.*) *Unisubsellium* is a Plautine word for μονοκοίτιον or σκιμπόδιον, as opposed to the *lectus* on which the more favoured guests reclined.

472. **Plagipatidas**, used of slaves, *Most.* 356 *Ubi sunt isti plagipatidae ferritribaces uiri?*, here of parasites, whose hard treatment has been already mentioned, vv. 88 sqq. (see note). Cf. Ter. *Eun.* 244 *At ego infelix neque ridiculus esse neque plagas pati Possum.* **Verba**, 'witticisms.' *Logi*

Eos requirunt, qui libenter, quom ederint, reddant domi;
Ipsi obsonant, quae parasitorum ante erat prouincia,
Ipsi de foro tam aperto capite ad lenones eunt
Quam in tribu sontes aperto capite condemnant reos;
Neque ridiculos iam terrunci faciunt, sese omnes amant.

---

473. cum ederint V^2J: comederint BV^1E (o *ex* om): comederunt *D* 474. erat *ex* eat *D* prouintia *V* 475. Isi *E* capite *ex* -to *D* 476. In tribu quam ap. *Niemeyerus* aperto capite sontes *libri*: *corr. Brixius* condempnant *libri* (*ex* cont- *B*) 477. iam B^2E: tam *ceteri* terrunti *D*: terrumci *E*: terrunci *ex* terrerunci *J* fatiunt *E*

---

ridiculi are the first item in the parasite's auction of his effects in the *Stichus* vv. 218 sqq.;

Nunc auctionem facere decretumst mihi:
Foras necessumst quidquid habeo uendere.
Adeste sultis: praeda erit praesentium.
Logos ridiculos uendo. Age, licemini, &c.

Penu. Plautus uses Nom. *penus* (Masc. in *Pseud.* 178, Neut. in *Pseud.* 228, a variety of Gender expressly attested by Charisius, p. 74 K.), Gen. *peni* (*Trin.* 254, *Pseud.* 608), Acc. *penum* (Neut. in *Capt.* 920, where see note, but without indication of Gender in the other instances, *Capt.* 771, *Men.* 120, 801). The form of the Genitive does not exclude a Fourth Declension origin, for the normal Gen. Sing. suffix of *u*-stems in Plautus is *-i*.

473. **Reddant.** For the Subj. in phrases of the *is sum qui* type, cf. *Truc.* 81 *postquam alium repperit, qui plus daret.* For the Ind. cf. *Trin.* 547 *Sed istest ager profecto, ut te audiui loqui, Malos in quem omnes publice mitti decet.*

474. Ergasilus secures this *provincia* ultimately for himself. See vv. 900 sqq.

475. **De foro** is substituted occasionally for *a foro* by Plautus for metrical convenience (cf. *Men.* 491, 599). **Aperto capite.** Petron. *Sat.* 57 *homo inter homines sum, aperto capite ambulo.* The opposite is *capite involuto* (e.g. Cic. *Phil.* ii. 31. 77).

476. **Tribu.** The Comitia Tributa are referred to. Since a pair of alliterative words are generally in juxtaposition in Plautus, Brix transposed the arrangement of the MSS., which involves an illegitimate hiatus, *Quam in tribu aperto capite sontes condemnant reos.* The last edition however (by Niemeyer) transposes *In tribu quam aperto capite*, in order to give exact assonance with *de foro tam aperto capite* of v. 475. With the 'echo' *aperto capite...aperto capite* cf. *Merc.* 834 *Di penates meum parentum, familiai Lar pater, Vobis mando meum parentum rem bene ut tutemini.*

477. **Ridiculos,** the parasites. Cf. v. 470. **Terrunci.** The

Nam ut<i> dudum hinc abii, accessi ad adolescentes in foro.
'Saluete' inquam. 'Quo imus una?' inquam: [ad prandium] atque illi tacent.
'Quis ait "hoc" aut quis profitetur?' inquam: quasi muti silent,

---

478. ut *libri* Nam <ego> ut *Bothius*^{3} (*cf. Seyffertus Stud. Pl. p.* 20) accessit V^1 (*corr.* V^2) ad addolescentes *J* 479. imquam *E* una E^3 *in ras.* imquam *E* 480. agit V^2JO profitetur *ex* profiteor *J* imquam *E*

Numeral Adverb *ter* was originally **ters*, and was in Plautus' time pronounced *terr* before an initial vowel, e.g. *Bacch.* 1127 *Rerín ter(r) in ánno tu hás tonsitári?* (bacchiac). *Non terrunci* (¼ as) *facere* is the phrase of Plautus, *non assis facere* of Catullus (xlii. 13), *non dupondii* (2 asses) *facere* of Petronius, a curious illustration of the gradual depreciation of money.

478. **Nam.** This use of *nam* to justify a previous general statement is common in Plautus (cf. v. 464). Where the Verb is in the first person, the usual phrase is *nam ego* (*Trin.* 25, *Men.* 96, *Mil.* 948, *Amph.* 637, *Most.* 133, *Pers.* 471, *Pseud.* 792, *Poen.* 451, *Rud.* 924, &c.). But there is perhaps sufficient evidence to allow the possibility of the omission of *ego*, e.g. *Bacch.* 388 *Nám ut in Éphesum hinc abii*, Truc. 554 *Năm hóc qui sciám ne quis id quaerat a me* (bacchiac). On the whole therefore I prefer to make the 'minimum' of change of the traditional reading and print *nam uti.* **Dudum,** 'a short time ago,' at the end of Act I. Sc. ii. (v. 194). This use of *dudum* is common in the Comedians.

479. Neither of the proposed scansions, *īmŭs ŭn-* and *īm(us) ūn-*, is probable; so the overloaded line must be relieved of a gloss. *Ad prandium* is more likely to be a gloss than *una*. The insertion of *atque* to explain Asyndeton (cf. v. 480) is frequent in the MSS. of Plautus (see note on v. 658), but the deletion of the word in this line would require a further change of *illi* (cf. v. 481) to *i*. On the double Hiatus see Introd. ii. § 44.

480. **Hoc,** the archaic form of *huc*. In his note on Virg. *Aen.* viii. 423 (*Hoc tunc ignipotens caelo descendit ab alto*) Servius says: '*hoc*' *pro* '*huc*' *posuit secundum antiquum morem: nam antea* '*hoc*' *adverbium loci fuit, quod nunc abolevit; nam crebro in antiquis lectionibus invenitur, sicut in epistulis probat Verrius Flaccus exemplis, auctoritate, ratione, dicens in adverbiis pro* '*u*' '*o*' *plerumque maiores ponere consuetos. Et sic pro* '*huc*' '*hoc*' *veteres dicere solebant, sicut pro* '*illuc*' '*illo*' *dicimus: unde etiam*

Neque me rident. 'Ubi cenamus?' inquam: atque illi abnuunt.
Dico unum ridiculum dictum de dictis melioribus,
Quibus solebam menstrualis epulas ante adipiscier:
Nemo ridet. Sciui extemplo rem de compecto geri.
Ne canem quidem irritatam uoluit quisquam imitarier,

---

481. caenamus *VJ* imqnam *E* 482. imum *V* (*ut vid.*) dictis (d *ex* u, *ut vid.*) *B* 483. solebam (o *ex* e) *D*. menstruales *B*: mestrualis *VE* 484. *versum laudat Charisius inst.* II *p.* 197, 13 K. (*testatus* de conpecto) 'spem de compecto gero.' sclui E^3 *e corr.* exemplo *D* compacto *libri* 485. Nec V^2J (*ut vid.*) *O*

'*hoc*' *o longum esse apparet, sicut* '*illo*' *cum pro* '*illuc*' *ponitur.* I doubt Servius' explanation of *hoc* as **hŏ-ce*, and prefer to regard both forms of the Adverb, *hoc* and *huc*, as earlier and later forms of the Acc. Sg. Neut. **hoc-ce* from **hŏd-ce*. For statistics of the spelling of the Adverb in Plautus see Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher* (Suppl.), 1891, p. 293 *n.* **Profitetur** with *ŏ* (the normal quantity of the vowel before *f*) recurs in Ter. *Eun.* prol. 3. The instances of *ō* (*Men.* 643, Enn. *Trag.* 293 R.) are not absolutely free from doubt; but Catullus lxiv. 202 has *prŏfudit* and Plaut. *Trin.* 149 *prŏfecturus.*

481. The hiatus at the pause after *inquam* (cf. v. 479) seems legitimate (Introd. ii. § 44). Schmidt, *Pron. Demonstr.* (Berlin 1875), p. 69, proposed to remove it by changing *illi* to *illisce*, just as *hisce* is generally substituted by editors for *hi* of the MSS. in *Amph.* 974 *Iam hi*<*sce*> *ambo, et seruos et era, frustra sunt duo* (cf. ad v. 653).

482. **De dictis melioribus.** The parasite in the *Stichus* says, v. 400:

Ibo intro ad libros et discam de dictis melioribus.

483. **Adipiscier.** The compound *adipiscor* (cf. v. 780) was not so common in the time of Plaut. and Ter. as it became later. But the evidence of its occasional use is too strong to be set aside (*Epid.* 15, *Stich.* 281, Ter. *Andr.* 332, *Phorm.* 406, 412).

484. **De compecto.** See note on v. 489.

485. **Canem...irritatam.** Lucilius *Sat.* 32 M. says of the letter R:

Irritata canes quam homo quam planiu' dicit.

Nonius (31 M. 23) gives the following account of *irrito*: *Irritare dictum est proprie provocare: tractum a canibus, qui cum provocantur irriunt.* (Cf. Donat. ad Ter. *Adel.* II. iv. 18 (282) *inritatus*] *ducitur autem verbum a canibus qui restrictis dentibus hanc litteram* '*r*' *imitantur*).

Saltem, si non arriderent, dentes ut restringerent.
Abeo ab illis, postquam uideo me sic ludificarier;
Pergo ad alios, uenio ad alios, deinde ad alios: una res!
Omnes <de> compecto rem agunt, quasi in Velabro olearii.
Nunc redeo inde, quoniam me ibi uideo ludificarier.
Item alii parasiti frustra obambulabant in foro.
Nunc barbarica lege certumst ius meum omne persequi:

---

489. *uersum laudat Osbernus p.* 615 'omnes rem gerunt quasi in uelabro olei' <de> *Fleckeisenus* compacto *libri* quasi | quasi *V* 490. inde inde *JO* quoniam *B*: quō DV^1E: cum V^2 *ut vid. JO* 492. certumst *E*: certum est *ceteri* ius *ex* iussum *E*

---

486. *Merch. of Venice* Act I. Sc. i.:

And others of such vinegar aspect,
That they'll not shew their teeth in way of smile,
Though Nestor swear the jest be laughable.

Ut. Cf. v. 424. **Restringerent.** Apuleius *Ludicr.* 8 B. *Restrictis forte si labellis riseris.*

487. **Postquam uideo.** See note on v. 24.

488. **Una res.** Fleckeisen proposed *una rest.* But apart from the question whether a form like *rest* was used by Plautus (Introd. ii. § 12), there seems no reason to doubt the possibility of an interjectional use of the phrase *una res* without *est*, like *tanto nequior* Men. 433.

489. **De compecto.** The insertion of *de* improves the rhythm. Still the Preposition might be omitted in this phrase, e.g. Afranius 90 R. *te facere conpecto omnia* (Cic. *Scaur.* 8, Liv. v. 11. 7), though it is found in the other two occurrences of the expression in Plautus, v. 484 (above) and *Pseud.* 540:

Quid si hisce inter se consenserunt, Callipho,
Aut de compecto faciunt consutis dolis,
Qui me argento interuertant?

Compectus is Partic. of *compeciscor* from *paciscor*, *păctus*; *compāctus* of *compingo* from *pango*, *pāctus.* **In Velabro olearii.** Schol. Cruq. ad Hor. *S.* II. iii. 229 *Velabrum locus Romae, ubi prostabant omnia quae ad uictus rationem et delicias pertinebant.*

490—1 are bracketed by Schoell (after Fleckeisen) as spurious. But the repetition of the phrase *me uideo ludificarier* serves to indicate the indignation of the speaker, while the fact that other parasites had been treated like himself strengthens his suspicion of a concerted plot.

492. **Barbarica,** i.e. Roman (see on v. 884).

[redacted]

Qui consilium iniere, quo nos uictu et uita prohibeant,
Is diem dicam, irrogabo multam, ut mihi cenas decem
Meo arbitratu dent, cum cara annona sit. Sic egero.
Nunc ibo ad portum hinc: est illi[c] mi una spes cenatica;
Si ea decollabit, redibo huc ad senem ad cenam asperam.

---

493. concilium *libri*: *corr. Bosscha* quos *J* prohibebant *ex* prohibeant *J* 494. His B^2 *ut vid.* V^2O (*J n. l.*): Iis B^3 *ut vid.*: Is *ceteri* dicat *D* multam (a *ex* u) *D*: multa *V* caenas *V* 495. annona (na *ex* sa) sit sit e. *D* aegero *O* 496. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 115 'est illic una spes coenatica mihi' portum (r *ex* s) *D* mihi *libri* caenatica *VE* 497. *versum laudat Diomedes art. gr.* I *p.* 365, 4 K. (*s. v.* decollo) 'una est decollauit' caenam *V*

---

493. **Consilium iniere.** *Pseud.* 543 *Si sumus compecti seu consilium usquam iniimus, Aut si de ea re umquam inter nos conuenimus*, where *consilium*, the reading of the MSS. (not, as here, *concilium*), is approved by the context. On the Proceleusmatic in the second foot see Introd. iii. § 14. **Victu et uita** is one of those alliterative phrases so dear to a Roman, like *vivus videns*, *nec vola nec vestigium*, *oleum et operam perdere*. **Prohibeant.** On the pronunciation of Compounds of *habeo* in Plautus see Introd. ii. § 15, and on the construction of *prohibeo* in Plautus see the note on v. 804.

495. **Meo arbitratu.** Cf. ad v. 867. **Sic egero.** Also *sic agam* (Ter. *Ad.* 786 *Aliquo abeam atque edormiscam hoc uilli: sic agam*). Similarly *sic dedero* (e.g. *Asin.* 439), beside *sic dabo* Ter. *Phorm.* 1027. On this use of the Fut. Perf. see note on v. 194.

496. **Cenatica,** a coinage after the type of *viaticus*.

497. **Decollabit.** Cf. *Cas.* 307 *Si sors autem decollassit, gladium faciam culcitam, Eumque incumbam.* The double *l* belongs to the ante-classical spelling of the word *cōlum* (cf. *quālus*, older *quallus*, *tēlum*, older *tellum*, *vēlum*, older *vellum*). The Palatine MS. of Virgil has *colla* for *cōla* in *Georg.* ii. 242; and Diomede, who quotes the Old Latin *decōlo*, giving it the sense of *decipio* (a sense which suits the two Plautus passages, but not Varro *R. R.* I. ii. 8), seems to have spelt the word with the double letter (365. 5 K.: *decollo, decollaui: hoc uerbum apud ueteres decipio significat, ut apud Plautum 'una est decollauit'; item Lucilius duodecimo 'quibus fructibus me decollaui uictus'*), for he goes on apparently (the passage is corrupt in the MSS.) to distinguish it from the other *decollo*, 'to decapitate.' **Cenam asperam.** Cf. vv. 185 sqq. The joke is kept up all through the play. See vv. 860, 884.

HEGIO, <ARISTOPHONTES>. III. ii.

HEG. Quid est suauius quam bene rem gerere
Bono publico, sicut ego feci heri, cum 499, 500
Emi hosce homines? Ubi quisque uident,

III. ii. HEGIO *libri* (*unius v. spat. D*: EGIO *J*: EG. *versui* 498 *sine sp. praescr. O*) *versuum initia in libris haec sunt* Quid, Cum emi, Gratulanturque, Retinendoque, Vix ex, Tandem, Rogo, Inde, Eo, Rogo, Nouerit, Dico, Eum sibi, Ut quod 498. Vid *c. sp. in. V*[1] (q *in marg. V*[2]) 501. enim hosce *J*: emi hosche *E* Ubi *VJO*

Act III. Scene ii. Hegio, accompanied by Aristophontes, an Elean captive whom he has found in his brother's *ergastulum*, comes on the stage by the left-hand door, and sings a song, in expression of his delight at the speedy prospect of recovering his captured son. This bright, lively Canticum, with its rapid variation of metres, stands in marked contrast to the dejected Palinode of Act IV. Sc. ii. Its arrangement offers considerable difficulty; for in the Archetype of our MSS. the original division of lines 498—503, and probably of others too, has been abandoned for the sake of saving space. I suppose the first and third lines to be Anapaestic Dimeters, the second and fourth Bacchiac Tetrameters (though in the second the pyrrich scansion *egŏ* is not what we should expect in Bacchiac metre). Then the metre suddenly changes to a Trochaic Octonarius *Íta me...reddídĕrunt.* Two Bacchiac Tetrameters follow, and then a line composed of four Catalectic Bacchiac Dimeters (or Dochmii?) *Rogó syngraphúm*, &c., a composition admirably adapted for the expression of a rapid sequence of incidents. The next line is generally scanned as a Bacchiac Tetrameter, but the shortening of the last syllable of *ilico* and the ictus on the second are quite unlikely. It may be an Iambic Dim. Catal. with a Bacch. Dim. Then comes an Anapaestic Tetrameter Acatalectic, followed apparently by a couple of lines composed of a Trochaic Dimeter Catalectic and a 'colon Reizianum.' The succeeding line may be a Trochaic Dimeter Acatalectic with the same 'colon Reizianum.' V. 513ᵃ is a Trochaic Dimeter Acatalectic, and the last two lines are Iambic.

498. Aristoph. *Plut.* 802 'Ως ἡδὺ πράττειν, ἄνδρες, ἔστ' εὐδαιμόνως!

499. **Bono publico**, Abl. So *malo tuo*, *Amph.* 366, *Truc.* 923, &c. But *cum* is often used, e.g. *cum cruciatu tuo* v. 681 (see note), *malo cum tuo* Asin. 130, &c. The state would regain a citizen by the recovery of Philopolemus.

501. **Ubi quisque uident.** Cf. *Poen.* prol. 107 *Omnes meretrices, ubi quisque habitant, inuenit*, Men. 522 *satine, ut quemque conspicor, Ita me ludificant?* With the Reflexive Pronoun and Possessive the use of the Plural is more normal, e.g. *Epid.* 212 *Filios suos quisque uisunt.*

[redacted]

Eunt obuiam gratulanturque eam rem :
Ita me miserum restitando retinendo[que] lassum reddiderunt.
Vix ex gratulando miser iam eminebam.
Tandem abii ad praetorem : ibi uix requieui : 505
Rogo syngraphum : datur mi ilico : dedi Tyndaro : ille abiit domum. 506, 507
Inde ilico praeuortor domum, postquam id actum est.

---

503. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 513 'me miserum restitando lassum reddiderunt' Ita *JO* *fort.* I. misere mis. que *del Hermannus post* lassum 6—7 *litt. spat. VE* reddiderunt *ex* redderunt *D* *in hoc versu* (*qui est ultimus fol.* 43 *v. in B*) *deficit D in ima pagina, tribus foliis vacuis relictis*
505. Tandem (*ex* Tān-) *V* habii *J* ad pretorem *BVO* : *om. E* ubi *J*
506. singraphum *V* : simgraphum *E* mihi *libri* illico *V* *post* dedi 1 *litt. er. B* de tyndaro *VJO* : de tindaro *E* 508. reuortor *B* : preuortor *VE*

---

502. **Gratulanturque eam rem.** *Stich.* 567 *Sed ego ibo intro et gratulabor uostrum aduentum filiis.*

503. The metre is very doubtful, but we can hardly allow the scansion *retinendoq*(*ue*) (Introd. ii. § 14). Admitting *itā* (Introd. ii. § 16), or changing *me* to *misere*, we might make the line into two Bacchiac Trimeters:

Itá me (mísere) miserúm restitándo,
Retinéndoque lássum reddídĕrunt.

Trochaic Metre is however unmistakeable in the latter part of the Canticum, and may well be anticipated here. **Ita.** Brix supposes this word to refer to v. 504, and makes *uix...eminebam* stand in Parataxis for *ut uix eminerem.* He compares v. 227 and such lines as *Mil.* 1047 *Qua ab illarum? nam ita me occursant multae: meminisse haud possum.*

504. **Eminebam,** a rare instance of this verb in the older literature.

505. For the Hiatus after *praetorem* cf. Introd. ii. § 44.

506. **Ille.** The Pronoun *ille* often takes the place of *is* (cf. v. 593). We have the two sometimes in the same sentence, e.g. *Epid.* 267 *quamis, uolt liberare, quae illum corrumpit tibi.*

508. **Praeuortor.** Brix adopts the emendation *reuortor.* Schoell retains *praeuortor* but changes *domum* into *domo* Dat., in accordance with the usual construction of the verb (e.g. v. 460). I see no reason for refusing to believe that Plautus could have used the expression *praeuortor domum.* He departs from the normal type of phrase in *Amph.* 528 *Ne me uxorem praeuortisse dicant prae republica* (cf. Sallust ap. *C. G. L.* v. p. 136. 23 *neu praeuerteret de se natos*).

Ego protinus ad fratrem inde abii, mei ubi sunt alii captiui. 509, 510
Rogo, Philocratem ex Alide ecquis omnium no[ue]rit.
Tandem hic exclamat, eum sibi esse sodalem.

---

509. Eo *libri*: *corr. Skutschius* abii *del. Spengelius* alii *ex* alli *V* 511. phylocratem *JO* et *an* ex *incert. J* alidae *E* hominum *Hermannus* 512. Tandem *om. JO* Hic *O* S. aristophon exclamat *J* (si ar.) *O* sodalem *in ras. V*

---

509. The MSS. offer *Eo...inde abii mei ubi*. Various remedies of the line are possible. One is, to suppose the scribe of some archetype to have written *abii* (suggested by *abii* v. 505, *abiit* v. 507) for *ubi*, and to have corrected his mistake in the careless fashion of mediaeval copyists. The true form of the line will then be:

Eo prótinus ad fratrem inde ubi mei súnt alii captíui,

an Iambic Septenarius. But the scansion *prótinus ád* is abnormal in an Iambic line (Introd. iii. § 9). Leo follows Pylades in omitting *inde abii* and prints an Iambic Septenarius: *Eo prótinus ad fratrém mei ubi súnt alii captíui*, which, if we admit elision of *mei* (Introd. ii. § 15), might be also scanned as an Anapaestic Dimeter with Colon Reizianum. Leo adds the explanation that Hegio's brother's house stood on the way from the praetor's quarters to Hegio's house, so that *praeuortor domum* (v. 508) will mean, 'I take the road for home,' and *protinus* will signify, 'without departing from this road.' But to delete *inde abii* is too violent treatment of the traditional reading. A slighter change would be to read *unde* for *inde*: *Eo prótinus ad fratrem, únde abii, mei ubí sunt alii cáptiui* (an Anapaestic Octonarius). This however requires us to suppose that Hegio paid a visit to his brother's house before going to the praetor, an unlikely supposition (cf. vv. 458—460). Probably it is the first word only of the line (an Anapaestic Octonarius) which is corrupt. Some prefer to delete *abii* as an insertion by a scribe who failed to notice that the punctuation came after and not before *inde*.

511. Most editors change *omnium* to *hominum*. And yet the phrase *ecquis omnium* (cf. *Men.* 812 *cuius rei rerum omnium*) is a permissible phrase, not wholly unsuitable here, and we have no right to take liberties with the MSS. without cause. With *omnium norit* (on the spelling in the MSS. *nouerit* see note on v. 8; cf. Introd. ii. § 32) the last part of the line will be a 'colon Reizianum.' With *hominum nouerit* we have two Trochaic Dimeters catalectic.

[redacted]

co eum esse apud me: hic extemplo orat obsecratque,
Eum sibi ut liceat uidere.
Iussi ilico hunc exsolui. Nunc tu sequere me,
; quod me orauisti impetres, eum hominem ut<i> conuenias.

TYNDARVS. III. iii.

:ND. Nunc illud est, cum me fuisse quam esse nimio mauelim:

---

513. esse (*om.* eum) B^1 (esse eum B^3): eum esse *VJO*: eam esse *E* 514. si *JO* illico *VE* exolui B^1 (*corr.* B^3) *VO* Nunc *J ut vid.* sequaere *E* . ut<i> *Hermannus.*
III. iii. *tit. om. J* (TYND. *praem. v.* 516): (III. iii—523 *O n. l.*) TINDARVS *V* . Unc *c. sp. in* V^1 (n *in marg.* V^2) nimio B^3: nemo B^1 *ut vid. VEJ* nelltri V^1 (tri *del.* V^2)

---

513. **Orat obsecratque.** These two verbs are often combined, the mal phrase being *oro obsecro* (*Amph.* 923, *Rud.* 882), *orat obsecrat* u. 321), &c., in Asyndeton. The addition of the Conjunction here is bably due to metrical necessity. With *med* <*hic*> *h.* we should have Trochaic Octonarius.

515. **Ut** is changed by editors to *uti* for the sake of the metre. But scansion *eúm-hominem* is also conceivable. Hegio and Aristophontes er the house in search of Tyndarus.

Act III. Scene iii. (Iambics and Trochaics). Tyndarus slips out the house (cf. note on v. 452), and gives lively, though not craven, ression to his terror of a discovery. (The slaves who are keeping tch on him perhaps follow in the next Scene.) The metre of this nticum, with its abrupt changes from Iambic to Trochaic and back in, is in consonance with the agitation of the speaker, and prepares the ctators for the exciting climax of the play that comes in the next Scene. es 516—525 make one continuous Iambic period, line 525ª is a Trochaic roduction to the rest of the Canticum, which is Trochaic, with Iambic erruptions at vv. 530 and 532.

516. **Nunc illud est, cum.** Ter. *Ad.* 299:

Nunc illud est, quom, si omnia omnes sua consilia conferant
Atque huic malo salutem quaerant, auxili nil adferant,
Quod mihique eraeque filiaeque erilist. uae misero mihi!

Plaut. *Fretum*, frag. 76 (quoted in note on v. 695), *Rud.* 664. **Fuisse.** note on v. 243. **Mauelim** may be Potential, 'I could wish,' though Ennius *Ann.* 414 M.: *Nunc est ille dies cum gloria maxima sese Nobis*

Nunc spes opes auxiliaque a me segregant spernuntque se.
Hic ille est dies, cum nulla uitae meae salus sperabilest,
Neque exitium exitio est neque adeo spes, quae mihi hunc aspellat metum,

517. spes *ex* so- V^1 se *Gulielmius Veris*, *p.* 300: me *libri*
518. sperabilis est *libri*, *cui* mecum *add. VE* (*J n. l.*) (*cf. ad v.* 519)
519. exitium *Pontanus ad Macr. Sat.* VI 2 '*ex cod. vet.*': exilium *libri* hunc mi *Bothius* metum *om. VEJ* (*cf. ad v.* 518)

ostendat, si uiuimus siue morimur, the reading *ostendat* is more likely to be right than the variants *ostendit* and *ostentat*.

517. **Spernunt.** This old use of *sperno* recurs in *Mil.* 1232 *Ille illas spernit, segregat ab se omnis extra te unum*, Enn. *Trag.* 161 R. *ius atque aecum se a malis spernit procul.* Our 'spurn,' the same Verb as *sperno*, originally meant 'to kick' (A.-S. *speornan*).

518. **Hic ille est.** Cf. v. 787, *Most.* 162. **Sperabilest.** In the old spelling *-is est* became *-est*, not *-ist*. Nonius (224 M.) seems to attest *similest* (MSS. *simile est*) for *similis est* in the early dramatists, with examples from Titinius, Naevius and Novius, and again (p. 198 M.) *qualest* (MSS. *culest*) for *qualis est* in Plaut. *Amph.* 537 (where the original of our MSS. of Plautus apparently had *quale est*, but *qualest* in the following line), and (p. 218) *pinguest* (MSS. *pingue est*) for *pinguis est* in a line of Novius, and possibly (p. 227 M.) *talest* for *talis est* in a line of Titinius: *uirgo nulla talest Setiae* (MSS. *est talis etiae*). We have many indications of this spelling in our MSS. of Plautus. (For a list of them see Leo *Plaut. Forschungen*, p. 259). But the evidence at our disposal seems to confine this spelling to *-is* when in conjunction with *est* (or *es*) and does not entitle us to accept Leo's explanation of *fidele sis* in v. 439 as a by-form of *fidelis sis*.

519. **Exitio**, the Verbal Noun from *exire*, recurs in *Truc.* 511 *Quid illi ex utero exitiost prius quam poterat ire in proelium?*, where it takes the usual construction of the Verb, *exire ex*. Here it governs *exitium* in the Accusative in imitation of that rarer construction of *exire* which is found in Virg. *A.* xi. 750 *vim viribus exit*, and which seems to have been known in the early literature also. Cf. Ter. *Hec.* 378 *limen exirem.* In *Mil.* 1433 the Ambrosian Palimpsest has *portam exierunt*, the Palatine MSS. *porta exierunt.* We have similarly *aditio* with the construction of *adire* in *Truc.* 622 *quid tibi hanc aditio est?*, *reditio* with the construction of *redire* in *Most.* 377 *quid illi reditio huc etiam fuit?*, Ter. *Eun.* 671 *Quid huc tibi reditiost? uestis quid mutatiost?*, *abitio* with the construction of *abire* in *Rud.* 503 *Quid mihi scelesto tibi erat auscultatio, Quidue hinc abitio?* The use of an Accusative after a Noun is normally confined to Verbal Nouns

[redacted]

Nec subdolis mendaciis mihi usquam mantellum est meis,
Nec sycophantiis nec fucis ullum mantellum obuiam est,

---

520. mendaciis *J*: mendatiis *BV*² *ut vid.* *E*²: mendatus V^1E^1 m. subdolis *libri*: *inv. Pylades* michi *J* 521. *versum laudat Philargyrius ad Verg. georg.* IV 377 'nec hi sycophantes—mantelum obuiam est' Ne *libri* (Nec *J*) sicophantus V^1 (*corr.* -tiis *ras.*) *EJ*: sicophantiis *BV ex corr.* fucis (fu *ex corr.*) *J*

---

in *-tio* in questions of the type *Quid tibi...est?*, where in Terence the Genitive is used, e.g. *Eun.* 671 (quoted above). But we have in *Amph.* 34 *Nam iusta* (MSS. *iuste*) *ab iustis iustus sum orator datus.* And the First Supine, which is really the Accusative of a Verbal Noun of the Fourth Declension, exemplifies the same usage, e.g. *oppugnatum patriam nostram veniunt* Liv. To these may be added Verbal Adjectives in *-bundus*, e.g. *vitabundus castra hostium* Liv. In Greek the construction is less restricted, being found with Verbal Adjectives, e.g. *ἄπορα πόριμος* Aesch., *ἔρωτα φύξιμος* Soph., as well as with Verbal Nouns, e.g. *ἐπιστήμονες ἦσαν τὰ προσήκοντα* Xen., *τὰ μετέωρα φροντιστής* Plato. The reading of the MSS., *exilium* for *exitium*, is easily accounted for by the similarity of T to L in capital script. **Neque adeo.** Cf. v. 348. **Mihi hunc.** Bothe transposed *hunc mi*; and certainly the Oblique case of a Personal Pronoun normally follows a Demonstrative in Plautus (see note on v. 337).

520. **Subdolis**, a favourite Adjective with Plautus. We have *subdola perfidia* in *Mil.* 943. **Mantellum.** The double *l* belongs to the ante-classical orthography (see note on v. 497). In classical Latin the word shews a Third Declension form with a single *l*, *mantele* (cf. note on *inuolucre* v. 267). **Mihi...meis.** For the double Dative cf. *Trin.* 313 *Istaec ego mi semper habui aetati integumentum meae*, &c.

521. This line is bracketed by some editors as a variant belonging to another recension of the play or else a parallel passage from some other play, originally jotted in the margin and later inserted in the text (see note on vv. 46—51). Others save the line by the substitution of *integumentum* for *mantellum*. To me the repetition seems not out of keeping with the speaker's agitation. Langen's statement (*Plautinische Studien*, p. 276), that *obuiam est* has in this line a sense not found elsewhere in Plautus or Terence, seems to be contradicted by the lines which he himself quotes, *Stich.* 523 *si tibi nulla aegritudo obuiamst*, Aul. 344 *quod te scio Facile abstinere posse, si nihil obuiamst.* **Fucis.** The Singular *fucus* occurs in its literal sense in *Most.* 275 (cf. Plaut. *Liparg.* frag. 1), and metaphorically in the phrase *fucum facere*, 'to bamboozle' (Ter. *Eun.* 589 *fucum factum mulieri*, Cic. *Petit. Cons.* 9). The Plural here is in keeping with

Neque deprecatio perfidiis meis nec male factis fuga est,
Nec confidentiae usquam hospitium est nec deuerticulum dolis:
Operta quae fuere aperta sunt, patent praestigiae,
Omnis res palam est,
Neque de hac re negotium est,
Quin male occidam oppetamque pestem eri uicem meamque.

---

522. deprecatio *B*: precatio *V*: praecatio *EJ* 523. hospicium *B* deuerticulum V^1E: diuerticulum BV^2J 524. Opera *J* fruere *E* praestigiae *V* 525—525ª *uno versu libri* 525ª. negocium *O* 526. heri V^2JO uicem meamque *add. in sp.* B^3 *ut vid.*

---

the other Plurals, *sycophantiis*, &c. (cf. note on v. 15). Cicero (*Att.* I. i. 1) has *sine fuco ac fallaciis* (cf. note on *offuciis*, v. 656).

522. **Deprecatio.** The original of *VEJO* had *precatio*, a reading which gives alliteration but would make the line a Trochaic Septenarius. It is unlikely that the Iambic period (see note on v. 525) was interrupted by a Trochaic line, so *deprecatio* of *B* is probably right.

523. **Confidentiae...hospitium,** 'lodging place for impudent assurance.' *Most.* 350 *nusquam stabulumst confidentiae*, Trin. 553 *Hospitium est calamitatis.*

524. **Operta quae fuere aperta sunt.** The Prepositions *ob* and *ab* appear in their older forms *op* (Gk. ὄπι-σθεν, Oscan *op*) and *ap* (Gk. ἄπο) in these two Compounds. The precise form of the (obsolete) Simple Verb is not certain. It may have been *verio*. **Praestigiae,** from *praestringo*, 'to dazzle,' with that loss of *r* which is seen in *increbesco*, &c. (see note on v. 902). The spelling *-stig-* is indicated by the Palatine MSS. again in *Truc.* 134 (but *praestrigiatrix* A), *Poen.* 1125 (but *praestrigiator* AB), and *Aul.* 630 (but *prestrigiator* B, A n. l.).

525, 525ª. **Omnis res palam est** is an Iambic Monometer, concluding the Iambic period. The first syllable belongs to the preceding line, *praestigi(ae) -om.* **Neque de hac re negotium est** is a Trochaic Dimeter Catalectic, introducing the Trochaic passage. 'Clausulae' of this kind at a transition from one metre to another are quite normal, so that all attempts to make a single long line are unnecessary, e.g. *Omnis palam est res neque hac de re negotium est* (Iambic), *Omnis res palam est, palam est res, neque de hac re negotium est* (Trochaic). **Negotium est** is humorously put for *dubium est* or the like, and is therefore followed by *quin*.

526. **Oppetamque pestem.** *Asin.* 22:

Ut tibi superstes uxor aetatem siet
Atque illa uiua uiuos ut pestem oppetas,

Perdidit me Aristophontes hic modo qui uenit intro;
Is me nouit, is sodalis Philocrati et cognatus est.
Neque iam Salus seruare, si uolt, me potest, nec copia
est,
Nisi si aliquam corde machinor astutiam.
Quam, malum? quid machiner? quid comminiscar? maxumas
Nugas, ineptiam incipisse: haereo.

---

527. aristophontis *B*: astriphontes *J* qui uenit modo intro *libri*: *transposui*: qui intro uenit modo *Camerarius* 529. copia *ex* -oa *O* 530. Nisi si *ex* Nisi a- *B* astuciam *B* 531. Qua *B*V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* cominiscar *J* maxumas *J ut vid. O*: maximas *ceteri* 532. ineptias *libri*: *correxi* incepisse hereo *JO* *fort.* maxumast Nugas ineptia incipissere: haereo

---

Ennius, *Trag.* 315 R. *prius quam oppeto malam pestem mandatam hostili manu.* **Meamque** is a humorous after-thought. There is no need of making the line a Septenarius by reading *meamque et eri uicem* with Niemeyer or *eri uicem et meam* with Bentley.

527. The MSS. have *qui uenit modo intro.* We get a Trochaic Septenarius (like v. 528) by re-arranging *qui intro uenit modo*, a Trochaic Octonarius (like v. 526) by *modo qui uenit intro.* The latter arrangement of the words was perhaps the more liable to be perverted by scribes and is preferable on that account. Leo's insertion of *huc* after *uenit* is also plausible, *hic qui uenit huc modo intro* (Troch. Octon.), but not Niemeyer's change of *hic* to *istic.* On *hic* see note on *seni huic*, v. 7. *Istic* would not be suitable here (see note on v. 38).

528. **Philocrati.** "This may be either Gen. or Dat., since Plautus uses Gen. in *-i* from such Greek nouns and with nouns like *sodalis*, *erus*, employs either case." Morris. See note on v. 635.

529. *Most.* 351 *Nec Salus nobis saluti iam esse, si cupiat, potest*, Ter. *Ad.* 761 *ipsa si cupiat Salus, Seruare prorsus non potest hanc familiam.* **Si uolt.** *Amph.* 1051 *Neque me Iuppiter neque di omnes id prohibebunt, si uolent, Quin sic faciam.* **Copia**, sc. *seruandi.*

531. **Malum** in its Interjectional use appears normally after an Interrogative *quid*, *quam* (or *quid tu*, *quam tu*, &c.), and seems in the sentence-accentuation to have been subordinated to the Interrogative, e.g. *Bacch.* 696 *Quám, malúm, fácile?*, Amph. 626 *Quí, malum, intellégere quísquam pótis est?*

532. The reading of the MSS. *maxumas Nugas ineptias incipisse haereo* is intelligible enough with punctuation as above or thus:

HEGIO. TYNDARVS. ARISTOPHONTES. III. iv.

HEG. Quo illum nunc hominem proripuisse foras se dicam ex aedibus?

III. iv. EGIO *O* TINDARVS *VJ* 533. HEG. *praem.* B^3J: TYND. *V*: *om. ceteri* Uo *c. sp. init.* V^1 (q V^2 *in marg.*) proripuiisse *E* seducam V^1 (*corr.* V^2) edibus *libri* (aed- *OJ ut vid.*)

---

maxumas
Nugás, ineptias? íncipisse. haéreo.

But the scansion *-tās in-* as an Anapaest in an Iambic line is very doubtful (Introd. iii. § 9), though the hiatus at the pause before *haereo* is legitimate, as is the change of person (cf. vv. 534—535). Leo alters *ineptias*, which he regards as un-Plautine, to *ineptus*:

Nugás ineptus íncipisso. haéreo

(*nugas* referring to the intended trick of denouncing Aristophontes as a madman). The non-occurrence of *ineptia* (used by Terence) elsewhere in Plautus, except in the prologue to the *Mercator* (v. 26), is not sufficient ground for doubting the genuineness of the word, in view of the frequency of the Adj. *ineptus*, the Adv. *inepte*, &c.; and *ineptus* in this line seems to me unlikely to be right. Brix thinks the line should be Cretic. Iambic metre is more probable, since v. 530 is Iambic. The least alteration of the traditional text is the change of *ineptias* to *ineptiam*. I have also thought of changing *ineptias* to *ineptia* and *incipisse* to *incipissere*, and in v. 531 *maxumas* to *maxumast*, all of them changes warranted by the clerical errors of our MSS. of Plautus (e.g. *Pers.* 491 *libertas* for *libertast*). (On the Verb *incipisso* see note on v. 802.)

Act III. Scene iv. Hegio, accompanied by Aristophontes and (apparently) by the slaves (see note on v. 551) who have been appointed to keep watch on Tyndarus, comes out of the house in search of the captive. Tyndarus, with that jaunty recklessness which we should call characteristically Irish, adopts the *atrox astutia* (v. 538) of pretending to Hegio that Aristophontes is a dangerous lunatic. We have quite as funny a scene with the supposed madman as in the *Menaechmi* (Act v. Sc. ii—v.), but the inevitable conclusion comes at last, the discovery of the plot of the two Captives. This is the longest Scene in the play, but the interest never flags for a moment; and we may be sure that the audience would have welcomed an even longer Scene. The same variation of Trochaic with Iambic Metre, that we remarked in the last Scene, is kept up at the beginning of this one, until the discovery of Tyndarus (v. 540). All the rest of the Scene is in Trochaic Septenarii, the common metrical expression

TYND. Nunc enim uero ego occidi: eunt ad te hostes, Tyndare.
Quid loquar? quid fabulabor? quid negabo aut quid fatebor?

---

534. TYND. *praem.* B^3J: *om. cett.* ted *Guietus* tindare *EJ* T. ei mihi *Lindemannus* (*cf. ad v.* 535) 535. fatebor *Lindemannus*: fatebor mihi BV^1EJ *ut vid.* (mihi *cum* Res omnis *conj.* V^2) (*cf. ad v.* 534)

---

of lively dialogue. The names of the three *lorarii*, who come out of the house at the end of the Scene, are given in v. 657, Colaphus (who speaks at v. 658), Cordalio and Corax. These names would however probably not figure in the ancient Scene-heading.

533. *Trin.* 276 *Quo illic homo foras se penetrauit* [*ex*] *Aedibus?* **Quo illum...hominem proripuisse...se dicam?** for *quo ille homo proripuit se?* Periphrasis of this type is common in colloquial Latin (cf. vv. 268, 541).

534. The MSS. end this line with *Tyndare* and the next with *fatebor mihi*. To prefix *mihi* to v. 536 involves the impossible scansion *ómnis* or the very unlikely scansion *omn(is) in* (Introd. ii. § 3). To read *Res mi omnis* is a great departure from the traditional text. The presence of *mihi* at the end of v. 535 in the MSS. might be accounted for by the habit of mediaeval scribes of writing an 'overflow' word of an extra-long line in the nearest available space. Thus in *Asin.* 474—5:

> ME. Malum hercle uobis quaeritis. LE. Crura hercle diffringentur,
> Ni istum inpudicum percies. LIBANVS. Perii hercle: age, inpudice,

the 'overflow' word of v. 475 (*inpudice*), written in the archetype at the end of the preceding line, is in our MSS. treated as a part of v. 474, which ends *diffringentur inpudice*, while v. 475 ends with *age* (cf. critical notes on vv. 518—519 of this play). Lindemann therefore makes this line end with *Tyndare: ei mihi!* It is however quite as likely that *mihi* is a marginal gloss on v. 536. I suppose hiatus at the pause after *occidi* (Introd. ii. § 44). Niemeyer breaks up the line into two Trochaic Dimeters Catalectic:

> Núnc enim uero ego óccidi:
> Éunt ad te hostes, Týndare.

Enim uero and *hercle uero* normally precede *ego*, while *uero* follows it, so that Fleckeisen's conversion of the line into an Iambic Octonarius, *Enim uéro nunc ego óccidi...Tyndare*, cannot be accepted

Res omnis in incerto sita est. Quid rebus confidam meis?
Utinam te di prius perderent, quam periisti e patria tua,
Aristophontes, qui ex parata re inparatam omnem facis.
Occisa est haec res, nisi reperio atrocem mi aliquam astutiam.
HEG. Sequere. em tibi hominem. adi atque adloquere. TYND. Quis homost me hominum miserior?

---

537. dii *JO* prius *s. v. O* peristi *libri* 538. rem *Redslobius* (*N. Phil. Rundsch.* 1886, *p.* 120) imparatam *ex* imper- *B*: imperatam *V*: inperatam *ex* inparatam (inpatam) *E*: imparatam *JO* 539. hec *E* repperio *VE* mihi *libri* 540. *ante* em 1—2 *litt. ras. B* (hem *non scriptum fuit*): hem V^2J alloquere *JO* quist *E* homonst *E*: homo est *VJO*

---

536. **Rebus confidam meis.** *Merc.* 363 *Nec qui rebus meis confidam mi ulla spes in corde certast.*

537. **Perderent,** Imperf. Subj. for Pluperf. Subj., as e.g. in *Rud.* 494 *Utinam tu priusquam te oculis uidissem meis, Malo cruciatu in Sicilia perbiteres,* &c. **Periisti e patria.** Cf. *Rud.* 1111 *quibuscum parua Athenis periit,* Poen. prol. 86 *Cum nutrice una periere a Magaribus,* Poen. 987 *Qui illim sexennis perierim Carthagine. Perdo* Act. and *pereo* Pass. (cf. *vēn(um)do* and *vēn(um)eo, pessumdo* and *pessum eo*) often appear in conjunction, e.g. *Asin.* 244 *nisi illud perdo argentum, pereundum est mihi, Asin.* 637 *ego qui non perdo, pereo,* Bacch. 490, 1045, &c. **Facis.** The Subj. occurs after causal *qui* in *Mil.* 370 *ego stulta et mora multum, Quae cum hoc insano fabuler,* &c. The Ind. is permissible in class. Lat., e.g. Cic. *Phil.* I. xv. 36 *O beatos illos, qui, cum adesse ipsis propter vim armorum non licebat, aderant tamen!*

538. *Cas.* 827 *Facies tun hanc rem mi ex parata imparatam?* Redslob would change *re* to *rem* in this line of the *Captivi.*

539. **Occisa est haec res.** *Pseud.* 423 *Occisa est haec res, haeret hoc negotium, Men.* 511. **Atrocem,** here used for comical effect, does not occur elsewhere in Plautus. Terence employs the Adjective in *Hec.* 377 *incredibili re atque atroci percitus.* It belonged to the diction of tragedy rather than comedy.

540. **Adi atque adloquere.** These two Verbs are often combined, sometimes in Asyndeton, e.g. *Men.* 360 *Nunc eum adibo, adloquar ultro,* sometimes not, e.g. *Bacch.* 978 *adibo atque adloquar.*

[redacted]

ARIST. Quid istuc est quod meos te dicam fugitare oculos, Tyndare,
Proque ignoto me aspernari, quasi me numquam noueris?
Equidem tam sum seruus quam tu, etsi ego domi liber fui,
Tu usque a puero seruitutem seruiuisti in Alide.
HEG. Edepol minime miror, si te fugitat aut oculos tuos,
Aut si te odit, qui istum appelles Tyndarum pro Philocrate.
TYND. Hegio, hic homo rabiosus habitus est in Alide,

541. tindare *EJ* 542. Proquae B^1 (*corr. ras.*) V^1 (*corr. ras.*) *E* 543. sem *J* quantum *ante ras. VE* et sego *J* 544. usquam *J* seruitutem *ex* seruitutem seruitutem *E* 545. Edepol (l *ex al. litt.*) *E* si te B^3: iste B^1V^1E: is si te V^2JO (*ex* is te) 546. tindarum *E* philocratem V^1 (*corr.* V^2 *ut vid.*) *E ante corr.* 547. Egio *J* istic *Luchsius Comment. Pros.* I *p.* 6 abitus *VE*

541. **Quid istuc est quod,** a common periphrasis for *cur* in colloquial Latin. On the periphrasis **te dicam fugitare** see note on v. 533. **Dicam** may be Fut. Ind., as in v. 533, or Pres. Subj., for both Moods are permissible after *quid est quod*, e.g. *Pseud.* 9 *Quid est quod tu exanimatus iam hos multos dies Gestas tabellas tecum?*, Amph. 502 *Quid istuc est, mi uir, negoti, quod tu tam subito domo Abeas?* The Subj. is normal in the phrase *quid est quod metuas* (*Bacch.* 92, *Poen.* 884, *Pers.* 239; cf. *Pseud.* 1087), and similar expressions.

542. **Aspernari,** like class. *aversari*, which is found in *Trin.* 627 *Sta ilico, noli auorsari neque te occultassis mihi.*

544. **Seruitutem seruiuisti.** This phrase, so common in Plautus, was the old legal definition of a slave, Quint. VII. iii. 26 *seruus est...qui in seruitute est eo iure quo seruus, aut, ut antiqui dixerunt 'qui seruitutem seruit.'* It occurs in Livy (e.g. xl. 18), and in the Lex Cincia de Donationibus, a law passed in Plautus' time: *si quis a seruis quique pro seruis seruitutem seruierunt accipit isue duit....*

547. The metre does not give sufficient reason for changing *hic* into *istic*, for though the scansion *hĭc* is impossible (Introd. ii. § 5), hiatus after *Hegio* may be legitimate (see note on v. 426). *Istic* is used in the next line, it is true; but the change of Pronoun probably corresponds to a change of position of the characters on the stage (see note on v. 293). *Istum* in the preceding line implies that at the moment of Hegio's remark

Ne tu quod istic fabuletur auris inmittas tuas.
Nam istic hastis insectatus est domi matrem et patrem,
Et illic isti qui insputatur morbus interdum uenit.
Proin tu ab istoc procul recedas. HEG. Ultro istum a me. ARIST. Ain, uerbero?

---

548. istuc *VE* aures *ex* auris *O* immittas *libri praeter E* (immitas *V*) **549.** hastis] istis *E*[1] (*corr.* *E*[2]) patrem et matrem (m- *ex* p *incoh.*) *V* **550.** isti (i- *ex corr.*) *E* qui insputatur *Pylades* '*ex cod. ant.*': qui sputatur *libri* **551.** abstoc *ut vid.* *J*

Tyndarus and Aristophontes were together. Tyndarus probably retreats after his declaration that Aristophontes was regarded as a madman in Elis (cf. v. 733).

548. **Fabuletur.** (For the Mood, see note on v. 363.) This Verb does not mean 'to speak nonsense,' though *fabulae* (like *logi*, 'mere words') is used interjectionally like our 'Nonsense!' It means merely 'to speak' (cf. *Trin.* 480 *Rem fabulare*, 'exactly!,' lit. 'you speak fact') and still survives in Romance in Spanish 'hablar,' the equivalent of French 'parler' (late-Lat. *parabolare*) and Italian 'dire' (Lat. *dicere*). Spain, be it remembered, became a Roman province about the time of Plautus. **Auris inmittas tuas.** *Epid.* 335 *neque ego id in aures immitto meas.* Whether the spelling of the single MS. *E* is sufficient authority for printing *inmittas*, instead of *immittas* in this line, is open to doubt. For the construction cf. v. 149 *istuc...animum induxis tuum.*

550. **Morbus,** the 'comitialis morbus' (so called because its occurrence was regarded as a bad omen, and caused a suspension of the proceedings at the Comitia) or 'morbus caducus,' our epilepsy. **Qui insputatur.** The late-Latin confusion of *isp-*, *insp-*, *sp-*, &c. (e.g. late-Latin *Spania* for *Hispania*, *iscola* for *schola*, &c.) so often shews itself in our MSS. that the change of *qui sputatur* to *qui insputatur* (cf. 553, 555) is a very legitimate one. 'The disease which is spit upon' is put for 'the diseased person who,' &c.; cf. Plin. *H. N.* xxviii. 4 *despuimus comitiales morbos, hoc est contagia regerimus.* For the remedy, cf. ibid. x. 23 *comitialem propter morbum despui suetum.*

551. **Ultro istum a me,** sc. *amovete*, addressed to the slaves, who, in accordance with Hegio's instructions (v. 456), are keeping watch on Tyndarus. Or it may mean merely 'I won't have anything to do with him.' Cf. *Amph.* 320 *Ultro istunc qui exossat homines*, Cas. 459 *Ultro te, amator, apage te.* **Ain, uerbero?** The punctuation should be put after *uerbero*, to judge from lines like 892, *Asin.* 485 *Quid, uerbero? ain tu furcifer? erum nos[met] fugitare censes?*, Amph. 284 *Ain tu uero,*

Me rabiosum atque insectatum esse hastis meum memoras patrem,
Et eum morbum mihi esse, ut qui me opus sit insputarier?
TYND. Ne uerere, multos iste morbus homines macerat,
Quibus insputari saluti fuit atque is profuit.
ARIST. Quid tu autem? etiam huic credis? HEG. Quid ego credam huic? ARIST. Insanum esse me?

---

552. |||atque||| *e corr. inter* 2 *litt. ras. B ut vid.* 553. michi *E*: mi *edd.* med *Bothius* 554. HEG. *libri*: *corr. Redslobius* 555. iis B^1V^1E: his B^2 (liis ?) V^2J 556. ego *om. J* m *ante* esse *eras. in B*

---

uerbero? Deos esse tui similis putas? But *ain* often has a dependent infinitive, e.g. *Epid.* 717 *Ain tu te illius inuenisse filiam?*

553. **Qui**, the old Instrumental (Ablative?) Case of the Pronoun is often in O. Lat. a mere enclitic Conjunction or Adverb like Gk. πῶς, e.g. *hercle qui*, *edepol qui*, a usage which in class. Lat. survives in *atqui*. In the phrase *ut qui* (v. 243, *Asin.* 505, *Bacch.* 283, *Curc.* 218, *Trin.* 637) there is usually a possibility of *qui* being the Nominative Case (as in *utpote qui*, *u. quae*, *quippe qui*, *q. quae*), but both this line and *Asin.* 505 *An ita tu es animata, ut qui...sies?* argue for the other origin of the word.

554. The alliteration is so obviously designed that I am inclined to transpose *homines morbus* in accordance with Plautus' usual practice with a pair of alliterative words (see note on v. 476). The MSS. assign this and the following line to Hegio, perhaps rightly, but the humour of the situation is heightened, if we give them to Tyndarus. *Quid tu autem* of v. 556 does not stand in the way of this disposition of the lines.

555. **Quibus**, governed by *fuit*. **Fuit.** On the *ū* see Introd. ii. § 6. Spengel's theory (in *Philologus* xxxvii. 440) that *fūi* was not allowed in every part (e.g. *Rud.* 217) of a line, but only (through metrical necessity) at the end, &c., was tacitly discarded by himself subsequently (*Reformvorschläge*, p. 409). **Is** Dat. Pl. The use of the Demonstrative in the same sentence with the Relative is found occasionally in Plautus, e.g. *Trin.* 1141 *Quem ego nec qui esset noram, neque eum ante conspexi prius*, Poen. 624, &c. **Profuit** merely repeats the idea of *saluti fuit*, a common mannerism of the colloquial Latin of Plautus, e.g. *Poen.* 1326 *gaudeo et uolup est mihi.*

556. **Autem**, in its common use in indignant or contemptuous questions, e.g. *Pseud.* 305 A. *metuo credere.* B. *Credere autem?*, Cas. 270 *Quid si ego autem ab armigero impetro?*

TYND. Viden tu hunc, quam inimico uoltu intuetur? concedi optumumst,
Hegio: fit quod tibi ego dixi, gliscit rabies, caue tibi.
HEG. Credidi esse insanum extemplo, ubi te appellauit Tyndarum.
TYND. Quin suum ipse interdum ignorat nomen neque scit qui siet.
HEG. At etiam te suum sodalem esse aibat. TYND. Haud uidi magis.
Et quidem Alcumeus atque Orestes et Lycurgus postea

---

557. uoltu *ex* uoltuin *ut vid. B*: uoltuu V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* (uoltnu?) intuitur *Bothius, Bentleius* optumumst *E*: optumunst *B*: optimum est *V*: optunum est *J* 558. sit *VEJ ut vid.* 559. apellauit *B*: appelauit *J* 560. Quin *Is. Pontanus*: Quia *libri* (*J n. l.*) ipsus suum *Niemoellerus 'de pron. ipse et idem,' p.* 13 quid siet *J* 561. Aut, *er.* u, *E* aiebat *libri* (agiebat *E*) haud uidi B^3: audiui di *ceteri* 562. alcumeus E^3 *ut vid.*: alcmeus *ceteri* (eu *ex corr. B*) aque *J* orestes *ex* ostes *J* ligurgus *libri* (lic- *E*)

---

557. **Hunc.** As in Greek (e.g. *οἶδά σε ὅστις εἶ*), so in colloquial Latin the subject of the dependent clause is brought into prominence by being made the object of the main clause. Cf. v. 376, &c., and see note on v. 337. **Intuetur,** changed by most editors to *intuitur* for the sake of the rhythm, is defended by Brix on the ground that the Second Conjugation forms *tueor*, &c. are normal in Plautus, the Third Conjugation forms being used through metrical necessity, at the end of the line or hemistich. In Terence however at *Haut.* 403 *intuitur* (for which some MSS. offer *intuetur*) in the middle of the line, is the true form, as is proved by the metre: A. *Quis nam hı́c adulescens ést, qui intuitur nós?* B. *Ah, retine me, óbsecro* (cf. Accius *Trag.* 614 R., Pompon. *Com.* 69 R.); and it must be confessed that the number of examples in Plautus is not quite sufficient to ensure certainty. **Optumumst.** See note on v. 10. (On *uiden* see note on v. 595.)

560. Niemoeller proposes *ipsus suum*, the normal phrase in Plautus (cf. note on v. 461). But the number of examples in Plautus is not quite sufficient to confirm him.

561. Cf. v. 512. **Aibat.** See note on v. 676. **Haud uidi magis,** 'a likely story,' e.g. *Merc.* 723, *Poen.* 141, *Amph.* 679.

562. **Alcumeus atque Orestes et Lycurgus,** a famous trio of madmen; cf. Anacr. 31 Θέλω, θέλω μανῆναι· Ἐμαίνετ' Ἀλκμαίων τε Χὠ

Una opera mihi sunt sodales qua iste. Arist. At etiam, furcifer,
Male loqui mi audes? non ego te noui? Heg. Pol planum id quidem est,
Non nouisse, qui istum appelles Tyndarum pro Philocrate.
Quem uides, eum ignoras: illum nominas quem non uides.
Arist. Immo iste eum sese ait, qui non est, esse, et qui uero est, negat.

---

564. mihi *libri* (michi *J*) mihi loqui mihi *ex* mihi loqui a- B^1: mihi loqui B^3 phanum *VE* (h *ex corr. ut vid.*) *J* quidem est *BV*: quidē *E*: quid est *J* **565.** istum *om. J* appellas *VEJ* philocrate *ex* hil- *E* **566.** non *add. s. v. al. manu B* **567.** ait *B ex ras. V ex ras.*: aut *B ante ras. V ante ras. EJ*

λευκόπους Ὀρέστης, Τὰς μητέρας κτανόντες. **Alcumeus** is the popular Latin form of Gk. Ἀλκμέων (Ἀλκμαίων), as *architectus* of Gk. ἀρχιτέκτων, *Purpureus* (*Porpureus*?) of Gk. Πορφυρίων in Naevius *Ann.* 67 M.: *Runcus atque Purpureus, filii Terras.*

563. **Una opera**, 'just as much' (to be distinguished from *eadem opera* v. 450). The origin of this phrase of colloquial Lat. is seen from *Pseud.* 318 *qua opera credam tibi, Una opera alligem fugitiuam canem agninis lactibus.*

564. **Non ego te noui** (with the accentuation *non égo te nóui*) is a common jeering phrase, e.g. *Amph.* 518 *Cárnifex, non égo te nóui? ábin a conspectú meo?*, Afran. *Com.* 253 R. *Non égo te nóui tristem, saeuom, sérium?*, but here seems to be used in a literal sense.

565. **Nouisse.** See note on v. 986. **Appelles.** This is the reading of *B*, while the original of the other MSS. (*VEJ*) had *appellas.* Both Ind. and Subj. are permissible in Plautus (see note on v. 537); and it may be argued that *appellas*, as the 'lectio difficilior,' should be preferred. But the evidence of *B* demands more credence than the evidence of P^a (Introd. i. § 10).

567. Notice the grouping together of the Pronouns and of the Substantive Verb. Cf. *Mil.* 956 *Eius hunc mi anulum ad te ancilla porro ut deferrem dedit*, Pseud. 219, &c., and see note on v. 645. **Vero** in its literal sense, as in *Most.* 178 *Eho, mauis uituperarier falso quam uero extolli?* &c.

TYND. Tu enim repertu's, Philocratem qui superes ueriuerbio.

ARIST. Pol ego ut rem uideo, tu inuentu's, uera uanitudine

Qui conuincas: sed quaeso hercle, agedum aspice ad me. TYND. Em. ARIST. Dic modo:

Tun negas te Tyndarum esse? TYND. Nego, inquam. ARIST. Tun te Philocratem

Esse ais? TYND. Ego, inquam. ARIST. Tune huic credis? HEG. Plus quidem quam tibi aut—mihi.

---

568. TYND. B^2: *om. ceteri* (*J n. l.*) *ante* ueriuerbio 1 *litt. eras. B* 569. *versum laudat Nonius p.* 184, 2 (*s. v.* vanitudo) 'pol ego...uanitudine' ARIST. *om. VE* (*J n. l.*) uero a uan. *codd. Nonii* 570. quaeso *al. manu ex* queso *B*: queso *E* TYND. Em. ARIST. *om. J* 571. Tun negas te *Bosscha*: Te negas *libri* tindarum *E* tu te *VEJ* (t *alt. ex corr.*) philocrate *E* 572. esse...HEG. *om.* V^1 (*add.* V^2) aias V^2E (*J n. l.*) *ante* ais *eras. punct. ut vid. B* TYND. *add.* E^2 tibi quidem quam *E* michi *E*

---

568. *Pseud.* 631 *Vae tibi! tu inuentu's uero, meam qui furcilles fidem.* See note on v. 1033.

569. **Ut rem uideo.** Cf. *Truc.* 962 *ut rem natam uideo*, Bacch. 218, *Cas.* 343.

570. **Aspice ad me,** 'look in my direction.' *Aspicio* normally takes the Acc. in Plautus, so that *aspice ad me* (cf. *asp. ad sinisteram* Merc. 879, *ad terram* Cist. 693) must be translated differently from *aspice me.* Similarly *aspice huc* Amph. 778, *me huc aspice* Amph. 750.

571. The MSS. offer *Te negas Tyndarum esse*, which will not scan. Since *tu negas* (*Amph.* 434, *Men.* 822, Ter. *Andr.* 909) or *tun negas* (*Amph.* 758, *Men.* 630) are formulas (but not the only formulas; cf. *Men.* 750, *Poen.* 777) found in sentences of this kind, editors read *Tu(n) negas te Tyndarum esse?* The arrangement *te negas tu* is un-Plautine. The shortening of the first syllable of *inquam* in this and the following line is excused by the subordination of the Verb to the preceding word (Introd. ii. § 23). Another possible reading would be *Denegas te*, but the reply of Tyndarus would then naturally be *denego inquam.*

572. **Ais.** *Aio* and *nego* are frequently contrasted, e.g. *Men.* 162, *Rud.* 427, 1331, Naev. *Com.* 125 R., Ter. *Eun.* 252. **Ego, inquam.** *Amph.* 725 A. *Tu me heri hic uidisti?* B. *Ego inquam*, Most. 369 A. *Tutin uidisti?* B. *Egomet inquam.* **Aut—mihi.** Hegio's suspicions begin to be aroused.

Nam ille quidem, quem tu hunc memoras esse, hodie hinc abiit Alidem
Ad patrem huius. ARIST. Quem patrem, qui seruus est? TYND. Et tu quidem
Seruus et liber fuisti, et ego me confido fore,
Si huius huc reconciliasso in libertatem filium.
ARIST. Quid ais, furcifer? tun te<te> gnatum memoras liberum?
TYND. Non equidem me Liberum, sed Philocratem esse aio. ARIST. Quid est?
Ut scelestus, Hegio, nunc iste te ludos facit!

---

573. hunc *om.* *VEJ* memoras *ex* mae- *B*: memeras *E*[1] (*corr.* *E*[2]) 575. Seruus] *J n. l.* Seruus es, l. *Fleckeisenus* 576. hunc *libri* (huc *J*) reconliasso *B* 577. te *libri*: *corr. Gruterus* natum *V*[2] gn. <esse> *Pylades* 579. egio *VEJ* te *om. libri*: *add. Gruterus*

---

573. **Alidem.** See note on v. 94.

574. **Quem patrem?** See note on v. 450. A slave was not in Roman law considered to have a father.

575. **Seruus et liber.** Most editors follow Fleckeisen in changing *et* to *es*: *Seruus es, liber fuisti*, but the correction, though very attractive, is surely not necessary. Tyndarus constructs the sentence in such a way that it may seem true to both his hearers, and rather affects than avoids ambiguity.

576. **Reconciliasso.** See notes on vv. 33, 168.

577. The simplest remedy of the line is to change *te* to *tete*, a form very liable to be reduced by Haplography (e.g. Ter. *Phorm.* 467 *tete* ADG[1], *te* BCEFP). Most editors insert *esse* after *gnatum.* The proposal to read *te gnatum tune* must be rejected, for *tun te* is an inseparable combination. **Quid ais?** usually merely calls attention to a following remark, 'look here.' It is however often used, as here, in reference to a remark just made by the other speaker (e.g. *Bacch.* 600, *Curc.* 190, *Merc.* 455, 534, *Most.* 959, *Rud.* 981).

578. "In this verse and in 576 Tyndarus is trying to hint to Aristophontes the real state of affairs." Morris. **Quid est?** 'Well, I never—.' Cf. *Amph.* 556 *Quid est? quo modo?*, 735, &c.

579. **Te ludos facit.** The Acc. is commoner than the Dat. (*Merc.* 225, *Most.* 427, *Rud.* 593, *Truc.* 759) after *ludos* (never 'ludum') *facere.* The MSS. have lost *te* after *iste* through Haplography.

Nam is est seruus ipse, neque praeter se umquam ei seruus fuit.
TYND. Quia tute ipse eges in patria nec tibi qui uiuas domist,
Omnis inueniri similis tui uis; non mirum facis:
Est miserorum, ut maleuolentes sint atque inuideant bonis.
ARIST. Hegio, uide sis, ne quid tu huic temere insistas credere.
Atque, ut perspicio, profecto iam aliquid pugnae [e]dedit.

---

580. preter *BV* se umquam *B*: eum quam *VE*: eum quisquam *J* ei *s. v. al. man. in B* *ante* fuit 4 *litt. eras. in B* 581. domi est *VJ* 582. inueniri *Camerarius*: inuenire *libri* tui *Fleckeisenus*: tibi *libri* miri E^1 (*corr.* E^2 *ut vid.*) 583. misero|||rum *B* (o *et* r *e corr.*, 1 *litt. eras.*) indeant *B* 584. ARIST. *om.* V^1 (*add.* V^2) *E* Egio *J* 585. ut *om. J* perspitio *VE* aedidit *BV*: edidit *EJ*: *corr. Scioppius*

---

580. **Ipse.** Niemoeller would substitute the emphatic form *ipsus* on the strength of passages like v. 990, *Asin.* 379 *illest ipsus*, &c. See note on v. 560.

581. **Qui uiuas.** *Trin.* 561 *Nam qui uiuamus nihil est, si illum amiserit*, Vidul. 87 *Qum mihi qui uiuam copiam inopi facis.*

582. **Tui.** The MSS. have *tibi*, but the construction of *similis* with the Dat. is very doubtful in Plautus (cf. *Mil.* 240, *Amph.* 601, *Bacch.* 8, *Men.* 1088–9, *Truc.* 505).

583. **Est miserorum ut...sint.** The same construction is found, e.g. *Pers.* 46 *hoc meumst ut faciam sedulo*, Most. 789 *Antiquom obtines hoc tuom, tardus ut sis*, &c.; the Infinitive, e.g. *Stich.* 716 *haud tuom istuc est, te uereri*, Poen. 572 *haud uostrum est iracundos esse*, &c. **Bonis**, 'the well-to-do,' 'respectable.' *Curc.* 475 *In foro infimo boni homines atque dites ambulant.*

585. **Atque** has here and often elsewhere (e.g. v. 355) its original sense of *atque adeo*, 'and indeed,' 'and further.' The change of *pugnae edidit* (*aedidit*) of the MSS. to *pugnae dedit* improves the rhythm, for *iam*, being emphatic, should not be elided, and the Gen. Sing. termination *-ae* seems not to be elided in Plautus (Leo *Plaut. Forsch.* 312). *Pugnam dare* is the usual phrase (e.g. *Bacch.* 273 *Porro etiam ausculta pugnam quam uoluit dare*, Ter. *Eun.* 899 *Dabit hic pugnam aliquam denuo*, &c.), the other belonging

[redacted]

Filium tuum quod redimere se ait, id ne utiquam mihi placet.
TYND. Scio te id nolle fieri: efficiam tamen ego id, si di adiuuant.
Illum restituam huic, hic autem in Alidem me meo patri.
Propterea ad patrem hinc amisi Tyndarum. ARIST. Quin tute is es:
Neque praeter te in Alide ullus seruus istoc nominest.
TYND. Pergin seruom me exprobrare esse, id quod ui hostili optigit?
ARIST. Enim iam nequeo contineri. TYND. Heus, audin quid ait? quin fugis?

---

586. ne iniquam V^1: ne imquam E: ne inquam V^2J (ne *ex* nec *ras.*) 587. TYND. *om.* V^1 (*add.* V^2) E effitiam V: eficiam E ego *ex* i- B sibi E: si dii J 588. me memoro E^1 (*corr.* E^2) 589. tindarum EJ 590. preter BV *post* praeter 2 *l. eras.* J nominest *ex* nomienest E: nomine est V (no *ex* m) J 591. Pergim E exprobare J ui] in *ut vid.* J 592. ARIST. *om.* VEJ Enim *Bothius*: Enim uero *libri* TYND. *om.* VJ: 6 *litt. sp.* E heus *ex* hus E audin quid ait B^2: inquid ait B^1V^1E: tu quid agis V^2J

---

apparently to elevated diction, e.g. Lucr. iv. 1010 *Accipitres somno in leni si proelia pugnas Edere sunt persectantes visaeque volantes.* In Cic. *Att.* I. xvi. 1 *quas ego pugnas et quantas strages edidi!* we have apparently a quotation from an old drama.

586. **Quod...id.** The origin of *quod*, 'whereas,' is seen in lines like this and Ter. *Haut.* 204 *Et quod illum insimulat durum, id non est.* For the Neuter of *is* we often find *ea res*, as in Ter. *Hec.* 581 *Teque ante quod me amare rebar, ei rei firmasti fidem*, and in the preamble of decrees of the Senate, *quod...verba fecit, de ea re ita censuerunt.* But the Demonstrative is often omitted. Instead of the Ind. the Subj. is permissible, e.g. *Aul.* 91 *Quod quispiam ignem quaerat, extingui uolo*, Asin. 796 *Quod illa autem simulet, quasi grauedo profluat, Hoc ne sic faciat.*

588. "In these lines Tyndarus again tells Aristophontes, as plainly as he can without exciting the suspicion of Hegio, that he has changed places with Philocrates in order to allow him to escape. Failing to make Aristophontes understand, he falls back upon his original plan of exciting him to fury by ingenious perversions of all that he says." Morris.

592. *Men.* 253 *Verum tamen nequeo contineri quin loquar*, Rud. 1172, *Men.* 1124 *contineri quin complectar non queo.* **Enim.** The MSS.

Iam illic hic nos insectabit lapidibus, nisi illunc iubes
Conprehendi. ARIST. Crucior. TYND. Ardent oculi: fit opus, Hegio;
Viden tu illi maculari corpus totum maculis luridis?
Atra bilis agitat hominem. ARIST. At pol te, si hic sapiat senex,
Pix atra agitet apud carnuficem tuoque capiti inluceat.
TYND. Iam deliramenta loquitur, laruae stimulant uirum,

---

593. Iam B^3 *in* 6 *litt. sp.*: Tam *ut vid. J* insectabitur V^2J illunc *ex* illuc *B* 594. Conprehendi *B*: Cōprehendi *V*: Cōprehendi *ex* Cōphrehendi *E*: Compraehendi *J* crutior *VE ut vid.* egio *J* 596. agitant *J* 597. Atra pix ag. *libri*: *corr. Lindemannus* aput *J* carnuficem *J*: carnificem *ceteri* (*ex* cr- *B*) que *s. v. B* tuo quae *Leo* capiti *ex* capite *J* illuceat *J* 598. TYND. *om. VE* larue B^1 (*corr.* B^3) *E*

---

have *enimuero*, apparently a gloss, just as in *Stich.* 616 the Ambrosian Palimpsest substitutes *enimuero* for *enim* of the Palatine MSS.

593. **Insectabit lapidibus.** Cf. *Poen.* 528, *Rud.* 843. (Also Laber. *Com.* 141 R. *uxorem tuam Et meam nouercam consectari lapidibus A populo uideo.*) Plautus uses equally the Active and Middle forms of this Verb.

594. **Ardent oculi.** In the similar scene in the *Menaechmi* we have (v. 829) *Viden tu illi oculos uirere* (v.l. *lurere*)? *ut uiridis exoritur colos Ex temporibus atque fronte, ut oculi scintillant, uide.* **Fit opus,** *γίγνεται τὸ ἔργον*. Cf. v. 558.

595. **Viden...maculari corpus.** *Viden* is followed (*a*) by an Accusative, e.g. *Bacch.* 834 *uiden conuiuium?*, (*b*) by Acc. and Infinitive, as here, *Men.* 829 (just quoted), (*c*) by dependent clause with *ut*, *quam*, &c., e.g. v. 557, *Curc.* 160 *uiden ut anus tremula medicinam facit?*

596. **Atra bilis,** Gk. *μελαγχολία*. *Amph.* 727 A. *delirat uxor.* B. *Atra bili percitast; Nulla res tam delirantis homines concinnat cito.*

597. **Pix atra.** Lucr. iii. 1017 *Verbera, carnifices, robur, pix, lammina, taedae*, in a list of tortures. In *Cas.* 309, *Epid.* 119 we have an allusion to the punishment of slaves by putting them in an oven (*furnus*). The MSS. begin the line with *atra*, but the transposition is favoured by the rule that an alliterative pair of words stand in immediate proximity. The contrasted word begins the clause in similar contrasts in Plautus, e.g. *Amph.* 368, *Pers.* 550; so *Pix atra agitet* is preferable to *Atra agitet pix.* **Tuoque.** Leo suggests *tuo quae.*

598. **Deliramenta loquitur.** *Amph.* 696 *Haec quidem deliramenta*

[redacted]

<Hegio.> HEG. Quid si hunc conprehendi iusserim? TYND. Sapias magis.

ARIST. Crucior lapidem non habere me, ut illi mastigiae

Cerebrum excutiam, qui me insanum uerbis concinnat suis.

TYND. Audin lapidem quaeritare? ARIST. Solus te solum uolo,

---

599. HEG. Hercle quid B^1VEJ: HEG. Quid B^3: *correxi* Quid ais? quid si *Seyffertus* comprehendi *BV*: conpraehendi (cli?) *E*: compraehendi *J* Hercle qui, si...iusseris sapias (*Tyndari omnia*) *Leo* 600. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 359 'crucior—excutiam' Crutior *EJ* mastigie *BV* (*ras. ex* -ae): mastigiae (st *ex* ct *ut vid.*) *E* 601. concinat *libri* (*ex* conna—c *ut vid. B*) 602. queritare *libri*

---

loquitur, Men. 920 *Audin tu ut deliramenta loquitur?* **Laruae** (always trisyllabic in Plautus). *Amph.* 777 *Nam haec quidem edepol laruarum plenast*, Aul. 642 *Laruae hunc atque intemperiae insaniaeque agitant senem.* Cf. *Men.* 890 *Num laruatus aut cerritust?* The *laruae* were the ghosts of evil-doers (as opposed to the *manes*, lit. 'good spirits'), and were supposed to produce madness in their victims. Nonius (p. 44 M. 24): *Cerriti et larvati male sani, et aut Cereris ira aut larvarum incursatione animo vexati.*

599. In the MSS. the line begins with *Hercle quid*, but the corrector (B^3) of the *Codex Vetus*, whose corrections are usually right, makes it begin with *Quid.* I fancy that in the Archetype the juxtaposition of the word *Hegio* and the 'nota personae' *HE.* caused confusion. The scribe of the immediate original of our MSS. mistook *HE.* for a contraction of *hercle*; the corrector of the *Codex Vetus* thought the word *Hegio* superfluous. Leo rewrites the line *Hercle qui si hunc comprehendi iusseris, sapias magis*, and assigns the whole of it to Tyndarus. Seyffert once suggested *Quid ais? quid si* (as in v. 613). *Hegio*, if it begins the line, should be scanned as a dactyl, as in v. 558, for *comprehendo* is normally a quadrisyllable in Plautus. **Quid si**, with Subj. (cf. ad v. 613).

600. **Crucior...habere me.** This construction of *crucior* (*discrucior*) recurs in *Bacch.* 435, 1099, *Mil.* 1321, *Poen.* 842, *Stich.* 10. Cf. Ter. *Haut.* 673 *Crucior bolum mihi tantum ereptum.*

601. **Concinnat**, the colloquial equivalent of *reddit*, e.g. v. 818, &c

602. **Solus...solum.** *Mil.* 1019 *cedo te mihi solae solum*, Asin. 500, *Trin.* 153. **Te...uolo**, 'I wish to speak with you,' a common phrase, e.g. *Pseud.* 251. We have *te uolo conloqui* in *Amph.* 899.

Hegio. Heg. Istinc loquere, si quid uis, procul. tamen audiam.
Tynd. Namque edepol, si adbites propius, os denasabit tibi
Mordicus. Arist. Neque pol me insanum, Hegio, esse creduis
Neque fuisse umquam, neque esse morbum quem istic autumat.
Verum si quid metuis a me, iube me uinciri: uolo,
Dum istic itidem uinciatur. Tynd. Immo enim uero, Hegio,
Istic, qui uolt, uinciatur. Arist. Tace modo, ego te, Philocrates
False, faciam ut uerus hodie reperiare Tyndarus.

---

603. Egio *J* istinc *ex* istuc (-tic?) *B* 604. habites *J* hos *E* 605. Hegio *om. J* credius *VJ*: crudius (-duis?) E^1 (cre- E^2) 606. quem *om.* B^1 (*add. in marg.* B^3) 607. uincire *B*: uincinri *J* 608. uitiatur V^1 (n *s. v.* V^2) *E* (*ras. ex* uit-) uero *om.* B^1 egio *ut vid. J* 609. uintiatur *VE* te *s. v.* B^3: *om. ceteri* phylocrates *J* 610. fatiam *E* tindarus *E* longius (*v.* 611) *in fine huius v. VEJ*

---

604. Sir John Vanbrugh, *The Relapse* (Act IV. Sc. vi.), "Pray, my lord, don't let him whisper too close, lest he bite your ear off." **Namque.** See note on v. 896. **Os denasabit,** like *malas edentare* Rud. 662, *caput exoculare* Rud. 731, *os exossare* Amph. 318.

606. **Neque fuisse...neque esse.** *Vidul.* 82 *Neque esse credo neque fuisse neque fore,* Amph. 553 *id quod neque est neque fuit neque futurumst.*

608. The normal pyrrich scansion of *enim* in Plautus will be retained in this line if we allow Hiatus before *Hegio.* (Cf. however Ter. *Phorm.* 555.)

610. **Te...faciam ut...reperiare.** See note on v. 557. Other examples of this proleptic construction (a very common one) with *facio* are, e.g., *Epid.* 606 *Si inuenio, exitiabilem ego illi faciam hunc ut fiat diem* (where the Ambrosian Palimpsest offers *ego faciam ut hic fiat dies*), Asin. 28 *ut ipse scibo, te faciam ut scias,* Pers. 414 *Possum te facere ut argentum accipias, lutum?* &c.

[redacted]

Quid mi abnutas? Tynd. Tibi ego abnuto? Arist. Quid agat, si absis longius?
Heg. Quid ais? quid si adeam hunc insanum? Tynd. Nugas! ludificabitur,
Garriet quoi neque pes umquam neque caput compareat.
Ornamenta absunt: Aiacem, hunc cum uides, ipsum uides.
Heg. Nihili facio. tamen adibo. Tynd. Nunc ego omnino occidi,

---

611. mihi *libri* (michi *J*) abnuto (o *ex* u) *B* Arist. *Lessingius*: *Tyndaro continuant libri* absis *ex* abis *B* (*corr.* B^3 *ut vid.*) longius *om.* *VE* (*J n. l.*) (*cf. ad v.* 610) 613. Heg. B^3 (H *in ras.*) V^2J: Arist. V^1E quod si *VE* 614. Carriet *V* quoi *Acidalius Div. p.* 88: quod *libri* unquam *B* caput *ex* capud *E* 615. Ortamenta *VE*: Hortamenta *J* ipsam *B* 616. Heg. B^3J: Arist. B^1 *ut vid.* *VE* Nihili *Lambinus*: Nihil *libri* (Nichil *EJ*) fatio *VE*

---

611. **Abnutas,** like *nutat, ne loquar* Men. 612. **Tibi ego abnuto?** In indignant or astonished questions of this kind the Dative Pronoun precedes the Nominative, e.g. *Trin.* 515 *Tibi ego rationem reddam?*, Aul. 759 A. *Nisi refers.* B. *Quid tibi ego referam?*, Men. 683 *Mihi tu ut dederis pallam et spinter? Numquam factum reperies*, &c., and normally bears the ictus.

613. **Quid si** Subj., e.g. *Curc.* 351 *Quid si adeamus*, &c. The Ind. is also found, e.g. *Men.* 844 *quid si ego huc seruos cito?*, Most. 582 *Quid si hic manebo potius ad meridiem?* **Nugas!**, 'nonsense!,' *Most.* 1088, *Pers.* 718. Is it from this interjectional use that the phrase *nugas esse, fieri* has arisen, e.g. Cic. *Fam.* VIII. XV. 1 *qui tam nugas esset* (*nugax* edd.), Varro *Men.* 513 *non nugas* (*nugasset* MSS.) *saltatoribus in theatro fieret?* Or should we seek the origin in a phrase like *nugas facere aliquem?* **Ludificabitur,** Absolute, as *ludo* Mil. 1066 *Quid est? ut ludo?*, or sc. *te*, as 579 *te ludos facit.* "Deponent here, but frequently passive, as in v. 487. Plautus also uses the active form, e.g. in *Amph.* 1041, *Cist.* 215." Hallidie.

614. **Neque pes...neque caput,** the Roman equivalent of our 'neither head nor tail.' Cf. *Asin.* 729 *nec caput nec pes sermoni apparet*, Cic. *Fam.* VII. XXXI. 2 *propter tuas res ita contractas, ut, quemadmodum scribis, nec caput nec pedes.*

615. **Ornamenta,** the stage attire, as in *Pers.* 160 A. Πόθεν *ornamenta?* B. *Abs chorago sumito*, Trin. 858 *Ipse ornamenta a chorago haec sumpsit suo periculo*, &c. For the miswriting (*h*)*ortamenta* cf. the MSS. of Ter. *Haut.* 837.

616. **Nihili facio,** 'I don't care,' a common phrase, e.g. *Merc.* 440.

Nunc ego inter sacrum saxumque sto, nec quid faciam scio.
HEG. Do tibi operam, Aristophontes, si quid est quod me uelis.
ARIST. Ex me audibis uera quae nunc falsa opinare, Hegio.
Sed hoc primum me expurigare tibi uolo, me insaniam
Neque tenere neque mi esse ullum morbum, nisi quod seruio. 621

---

617. ergo *VEJ* ne *V* fatiam *E* 618. HEG. B^3J: ARIST. B^1 *ut vid.* *VE* 619. ARIST. *om.* B^1V^1 (*add.* V^2) *E* egio *J* 620. haec *VE*: hec *J* expurigare *Ritschelius Opusc.* II. *p.* 431: expurgare *libri* (expugnare *J*) *post* tibi 3 *litt. sp. VE* 621. nu *J*: mi *ceteri*

Besides *nihili facere* (e.g. v. 986) we have also *nihili pendĕre* and *nihili esse* (see note on v. 921) in Plautus. From the last phrase comes his frequent use of *nihili* as an indeclinable Adjective, e.g. *Mil.* 180 *propter nihili bestiam*, *Cas.* 257 *armigero nili atque improbo*, often *nihili homo.*

617. *Cas.* 970 *Nunc ego inter sacrum saxumque sum nec quo fugiam scio.* The *saxum* is the flint-knife of the priest. Cf. Liv. I. xxiv. 9 (of the *pater patratus*) *porcum saxo silice percussit.* 'Between the altar and the knife.' Apuleius alludes to this jingling 'vetus proverbium' in *Metam.* xi. 28: *ergo duritia paupertatis intercedente, quod ait vetus proverbium, inter sacrum et saxum positus cruciabar.*

618. **Quod me uelis.** For the double Acc. see note on v. 978. The normal phrase is *si quid* (*me*) *uis* (or *si quid opus est*), e.g. vv. 603, 978, so that the unusually elaborate wording here, *si quid est quod me uelis*, indicates a studied politeness on the part of Hegio.

619. **Audibis.** In Fourth Conjugation Verbs the old Future, e.g. *audibo*, and the classical Future (really Subjunctive), e.g. *audiam*, were struggling for the mastery in Plautus' time. The two forms are often found in proximity, e.g. *Mil.* 1365—7 *scibis...scies*, Pers. 218—9 *scies... scibis* (although *scies* is much commoner than *scibis*). Similarly in the Imperfect, e.g. *audibam* and *audiebam*. **Vera,** sc. *esse.*

620. **Expurigare** (see Introd. ii. § 7). **Me** is object of *tenere*, as we see from lines like *Aul.* 71 *Nescio pol quae illunc hominem intemperiae tenent*, *Amph.* 581, *Epid.* 475, *Men.* 891.

621. **Mi.** This is a rare instance of the retention of *mi* Dat. in our MSS., which usually offer *mi* Voc. but *mihi* Dat. **Nisi quod,** 'barring'

[redacted]

At ita me rex deorum atque hominum faxit patriae compotem,
Ut istic Philocrates non magis est quam aut ego aut tu. Heg. Eho dic mihi,
Quis illic igitur est? Arist. Quem dudum dixi a principio tibi.
Hoc si secus reperies, nullam causam dico quin mihi
Et parentum et libertatis apud te deliquio siet.
Heg. Quid tu ais? Tynd. Me tuum esse seruom et te meum erum. Heg. Haud istuc rogo.
Fuistin liber? Tynd. Fui. Arist. Enim uero non fuit, nugas agit.

---

622. |||| At (*pers. nota er.*) *BE*: Arist. At *V* atque] aut *J* faixit *ut vid. B* patrie *J* 623. phylocrates *J* autu *VE* 625. siceous J^1 (*corr.* J^2) repperies *E* michi *EJ* 626. aput *J et B ante corr.* deliquio *ex* delinquio *ras. B* fiet *B* 627. tuas V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* seruom *J*: seruum *ceteri* herum V^2J Haud istuc rogo *proximis adplicant libri*: *corr. Pylades* 628. agit *ex* agis *V*

(cf. v. 394), is said to introduce a particular exception to a general statement (here *non mi esse morbum ullum*); *nisi quia*, 'all the same,' another statement which is inconsistent with the first, e.g. *Rud.* 1025 *Nescio, neque ego istas uostras leges urbanas scio, Nisi quia hunc meum esse dico.* But *nisi quia* occurs in the sense of *nisi quod* in *Cist.* 223, *Pers.* 546; cf. *Pers.* 517.

622. **At ita me**, a common formula in execrations, e.g. *Mil.* 501 *At ita me di deaeque omnes ament.* Its normal ictus is *át ita me* (also in *Mil.* 501, if we scan *di deaeque* in the usual way. See note on v. 172).

623. **Eho** is used in commands, as here, or in questions, e.g. *Mil.* 436 *eho, Quis igitur uocare?*, the phrase *eho an*, 'do you mean to say that,' being especially common in surprised enquiries, e.g. *Trin.* 934 *Eho an etiam Arabiast in Ponto?*

624. **Dudum**, 'already,' as in *Bacch.* 1018 *Eadem istaec uerba dudum dixi illi omnia*, &c.

625. **Nullam causam dico quin.** Ter. *Phorm.* 272 *Non causam dico quin quod meritus sit ferat.* Usually *nulla causa est quin*, e.g. *Cas.* 1002 *si ego umquam adeo posthac tale admisero, Nulla causast quin pendentem me, uxor, uirgis uerberes* (see note on v. 353).

626. i.e. 'spend the rest of my days as a slave in your house (*apud te*).' **Deliquio**, a by-form of *deliquium*, as *excidio* (*Curc.* 534) of *excidium*, &c.

TYND. Qui tu scis? an tu fortasse fuisti meae matri obstetrix,
Qui id tam audacter dicere audes? ARIST. Puerum te uidi puer.
TYND. At ego te uideo maior maiorem: em rursum tibi.
Meam rem non cures, si recte facias. num ego curo tuam?
HEG. Fuitne huic pater Thensaurochrysonicochrysides?
ARIST. Non fuit, neque ego istuc nomen umquam audiui ante hunc diem.
Philocrati Theodoromedes fuit pater. TYND. Pereo probe.

---

629. an *ex* ane *ut vid. E* mee *J* matri (at *e corr.*) *V* obstetrix *J*: -tit- *ceteri* 630. qui id tam *in fine v.* 629 *libri*: *corr. Pylades* qui id *ex* quid *V*: quid id *EJ* tam *ras. ex* itam *V* 631. hem *libri*: *corr. Brixius* 632. meam rem *in fine v.* 631 *libri*: *corr. Pylades* (Rem meam *invertens*) fatias *E* cura V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* tuam V^2J: tua *ceteri* 633. fuitne huic *in fine v.* 632 *libri*: *corr. Pylades* theusauro *VE* (*J n. l.*) chrisonico *V* (*J n. l.*) chrisides *V ex* chrs- (*J n. l.*) 634. non fuit *in fine v.* 633 *libri*: *corr. Pylades* nomen *ex* nomem *B* unquam *B* (*J n. l.*)

---

630. **Puerum...puer.** Cf. v. 645.

631. **At ego te uideo maior maiorem.** Cf. v. 1019. The rhythm would be improved by transposing *maiorem maior*. But the arrangement in the MSS. is the normal one. The order of v. 630 *puerum puer* may be referred to metrical exigencies at the end of a line. C. F. Müller (*Rhein. Mus.* 54. 385) inserts *uir* before *uideo*. **Em rursum tibi,** sc. *conuicium*, as in *Pers.* 705 *em tibi*, sc. *nomen meum*, Curc. 120 *em tibi*, *anus lepida*, sc. *uinum*.

632. Ter. *Adel.* 802 *Quando ego tuom non curo, ne cura meum.* The archetype of our MSS. had *num ego curo tua?*, which may possibly be right. It is however more likely to be due to the scribe's having drawn the horizontal line (indicating *m*) above the *a* of *tua* with a dry pen.

633. *Fŭi* is commoner in Plautus than *hūïc* (Introd. ii. § 6). So scan *Fúitne huíc patér.*

634. *Epid.* 496 *Fando ego istunc hominem numquam audiui ante hunc diem.*

635. See note on v. 288. **Philocrati** is probably Dat., since *huic* occurs in a neighbouring line (v. 633). But *pater est* with Gen. (e.g. vv. 4, 974) occurs nearly as often as *pater est* with Dat. (See note on v. 528.)

[redacted]

Quin quiescis dierectum, cor meum? ac suspende te.
Tu sussultas, ego miser uix asto prae formidine.
HEG. Satin istuc mihi exquisitum est, fuisse hunc seruom in Alide
Neque esse hunc Philocratem? ARIST. Tam satis quam nunquam hoc inuenies secus.

---

636. Quin *ex* Q|||n *B* <i> d. *Gulielmius Qu. in Capt. p.* 357 die•rectum *E*: dic erectum *V*² (*J n. l.*) 637. sussultas (as *e corr.*) *B*: sussultas *ex* sussaltas *V* (*J n. l.*) pre *B* 638. Satin (atin *E*² *e corr.*) *E* istuc *ex* i istuc *E*: *om.* *V*²*J* michi *ut vid.* *J* seruom *J*: seruum *ceteri* 639. esse *s. v. add.* *E*² philocratem *ex* phic- *B* tam *BV*²: ta *V*¹*E*: iam *J* nūquam *VE* inuenies hoc *J*

---

636. If we read *quiescis i* with Gulielmius, we must make the first word disyllabic (see Introd. ii. § 15), with its second syllable lengthened 'in pausa' (Introd. ii. § 33), unless we are to allow elision of *-is* before a vowel (Introd. ii. § 3); for *dierectum* is always a quadrisyllable in Plautus, with the first two syllables long. The word is normally joined with *i*, *abi*, *abin*, and the like (*recedin* Bacch. 579). In *Men.* 442 we have *ducit lembum dierectum.* The rhythm would be improved by reading *quin quiesce, i dierectum.* But it is quite possible that Plautus here ventured on the unusual expression *quin quiescis dierectum?* The combination of *quin quiescis* Ind. with *suspende* Imperat. need cause no difficulty. Cf. *Pers.* 397 *Quin tu me ducis, si quo ducturu's, pater, Vel tu me uende uel face—quid tibi lubet* (AP), Pseud. 891 *quin tu is accubitum et conuiuas cedo* (*et* AP), Asin. 254 *Quin tu abs te socordiam omnem reice et segnitiem amoue Atque ad ingenium uetus uorsutum te recipis tuom*, Most. 815 *Quin tu is intro, atque otiose perspecta ut lubet.* Leo proposes *quin quiescis, cor meum? i dierectum.* **Suspende te.** *Pers.* 815 *Restim tu tibi cape crassam ac suspende te*, Poen. 311, &c.

637. Anaxandrides (fr. 59 K.):

ὦ πονηρὰ καρδία,
Ἐπιχαιρέκακον ὡς εἶ μόνον τοῦ σώματος·
Ὀρχεῖ γὰρ εὐθύς, ἢν ἴδῃς δεδοικότα.

Sussultas. *Cist.* 551 *iam horret corpus, cor salit*, Aul. 626 *Continuo meum cor coepit artem facere ludicram Atque in pectus emicare* (cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 161 ὀρχεῖται δὲ καρδία φόβῳ).

638. The origin of *satin*, 'actually,' a mere Interrogative Particle in colloquial Latin (e.g. v. 653), is seen from this passage, where it is answered by *satis* (v. 639). **Mihi**, as in *mihi decretumst*, &c.

639 sqq. I have adhered to the order of the MSS., supposing the *tum*

Sed ubi is nunc est? Heg. Ubi ego minime atque ipsus se uolt maxume.—
Tum igitur ego deruncinatus, deartuatus sum miser
Huius scelesti techinis, qui me ut lubitum est ductauit dolis.
Sed uide sis. Arist. Quin exploratum dico et prouisum hoc tibi.

---

640. *post* 645 *transp. Schoellius* Heg. *praem. libri* (*corr.* V^2: *J n. l.*) Heg. (*post* est) *om. libri* (*add.* V^2J) maxime *VEJ* 641. *versum laudant Nonius* (*s. v.* deartuare) *p.* 95, 17 'tum...miser,' *Osbernus p.* 8 'ego erumnatus... miser,' *idem p.* 193 'aerumpnatus...miser' igitur *ex* ego *B* deruncinatus (er-?) *T* (*cf. Turnebus Adv.* xiv. 7): erumnatus *ceteri* (erumpnatus *J*): deunciatus *codd. mell. Nonii* 642. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 160 'hic...dolis' techinis *Ritschelius Opusc.* ii. *p.* 477, *Loewius Anal. Pl. p.* 211: thechnis *libri* (technis *ex* techi- *J*) 643. tibi *ex* m- *ut vid. B*

---

igitur &c. of v. 641 to be uttered after a pause for reflection. Brix, who is followed by Leo, transposes vv. 641—2 after v. 643, Schoell puts v. 640 after v. 645.

641. **Deruncinatus** from *runcīna*, a plane, *Mil.* 1142 *Ut lepide deruncinauit militem!* So *deasciare*, from *ascia*, an adze, *Mil.* 884 *Miles quem ad modum potisset deasciari.* **Deartuatus.** Nonius (p. 95 M.) explains *deartuare as 'per artus concidere.'* Hegio repeats the word in v. 672.

642. **Techinis.** The loan-word *mina* from Gk. μνᾶ retains its parasitic vowel even in class. Lat., but in other loan-words the vowel was abandoned (see note on *Alcumeus* v. 562). In Vulgar Latin, as the Romance languages testify, it never was given up (e.g. *cīcĭnus*, Ital. 'cecero,' from κύκνος). The spelling *techina* is preserved in our MSS. in *Most.* 550 and *Poen.* 817. **Ut lubitum est,** *Bacch.* 1095 *Is me scelus auro usque attondit dolis doctis indoctum, ut lubitumst,* Asin. 711 *quoniam, ut est libitum, nos delusistis.* **Ductauit dolis,** v. 755. *Ducto* is one of the many colloquial expressions for swindling. In *Most.* 845 there seems to be a pun on the two senses of the word:

A. Eho istum, puere, circumduce hasce aedis et conclauia.
Nam egomet ductarem, nisi mi esset apud forum negotium.
B. Apage istum a me perductorem, nil moror ductarier.

643. **Vide sis,** 'are you quite sure?' Cf. v. 883, *Merc.* 324 A. *Vide sis modo etiam.* B. *Visumst.* A. *Certen?*, Pseud. 48 *uide sis quam tu rem geras,* Ter. *Haut.* 374

HEG. Certon? ARIST. Quin nihil, inquam, inuenies magis hoc certo certius:
Philocrates iam inde usque amicus fuit mihi a puero puer.
HEG. Sed qua facie est tuus sodalis Philocrates? ARIST. Dicam tibi:
Macilento ore, naso acuto, corpore albo, oculis nigris,
Subrufus aliquantum, crispus, cincinnatus. HEG. Conuenit.

---

644. quin V^2J: qui *ceteri* niohil *EJ* inquam *ex* inuenies *ut vid. B*: imquam *E* tercius *J* 645. michi *J* 646. fatie *VE* tuis E^1 (*corr.* E^2) 647. oculis *Guietus, Bothius, Bentleius*: et oculis *libri* 648. cicinnatus *VE*: cinnatus *J*

---

644. *Pseud.* 748 A. *Ecquid is homo scitust?* B. *Plebi scitum non est scitius.* **Magis certius**, a common construction in colloquial Latin, e.g. *Men.* 979 *Magis multo patior facilius ego uerba, uerbera odi.* (For a discussion of this pleonasm see Norden in *Rheinisches Museum* XLIX. (1894), pp. 199 sqq.) **Certo certius.** Cf. Martial VIII. lxxvi. 7 *vero verius quid sit audi* (see note on v. 150).

645. The natural order *inde a puero* is departed from, as in *Mil.* 1151 *Maximum periclum inde esse ab summo ne rursum cadas.* **A puero puer.** Cf. v. 630.

647. The MSS. have *et oculis nigris*, but these 'instantaneous portraits' in Plautus (see note on v. 647) dispense with Conjunctions. Besides *et* will hardly scan. **Nigris.** The common word for 'black' in Plautus is *ater*, but we have *subniger* in *Merc.* 640 (quoted below) and *perniger* in *Poen.* 1113, in each case as an epithet of the eye.

648. **Subrufus.** There is no need of reading *subrufust*, for the verb is omitted in similar descriptions elsewhere, e.g. *Asin.* 399 sqq.:

> *A.* Qua facie uoster Saurea est? si is est, iam scire potero.
> *B.* Macilentis malis, rufulus aliquantum, uentriosus,
> Truculentis oculis, commoda statura, tristi fronte,

Merc. 638 sqq.:

> *A.* Qua forma esse aiebant <igitur>? *B.* Ego dicam tibi:
> Canum, uarum, uentriosum, bucculentum, breuiculum,
> Subnigris oculis, oblongis malis, pansam aliquantulum,

Poen. 1112, *Pseud.* 1218. **Aliquantum** probably with *subrufus.* Cf. *Merc.* 640 (just quoted) *pansam aliquantulum*, Ter. *Andr.* 447 *Subtristis uisus est esse aliquantum mihi.*

TYND. Ut quidem hercle in medium ego hodie pessume processerim.
Vae illis uirgis miseris, quae hodie in tergo morientur meo.
HEG. Verba mihi data esse uideo. TYND. Quid cessatis, compedes,
Currere ad me meaque amplecti crura, ut uos custodiam?
HEG. Satin me*d* illi hodie scelesti capti ceperunt dolo?
Illic seruom se adsimulabat, hic sese autem liberum.

---

650. Ve *libri* (*J n. l.*) 652. maeaque *ut vid. E* crura *B*, *sed* crur B^2 *in ras.* 653. Santin *B* (*J n. l.*): Satine *Ritschelius N. Exc. Pl.* I. *p.* 94 *adn.* me *libri*: *corr. Bothius* illisce *Muellerus Pros. p.* 729 capiti *B ante ras. J* caeperunt *BV*: coeperunt *J* 654. seruom *J*: seruum *ceteri* adsimulabat *V*: ass- *ceteri*

---

649. **Ut quidem,** as in *Aul.* 154 A. *In rem hoc tuamst.* B. *Ut quidem emoriar*, Trin. 429 A. *Factum.* B. *Ut quidem illud perierit*, &c. **Pessume processerim** (cf. Ter. *Ad.* 979 *processisti hodie pulchre*) refers to the Roman superstition of good or bad luck attending one's exit or entrance. Cf. *Stich.* 459 *Auspicio hercle hodie ego optumo exiui foras*, Epid. 183 *Liquido exeo auspicio foras aui sinistra*, Aul. 447 *ne ego edepol ueni huc auspicio malo.*

650. **Virgis.** The elm in Roman Comedy plays the part of our birch. Cf. *Amph.* 1029 *Verbero...ulmorum Acheruns*, Pers. 278 *ulmitriba.*

651. **Verba mihi data esse uideo.** This sentence recurs in *Mil.* 1434.

652. **Vt uos custodiam,** the same comic inversion as in *Asin.* 297 *custos carceris* (addressed to a slave).

653. **Satin.** See note on v. 638. If the scansion *hŏdie* is disallowed (see Introd. ii. § 13), there will be a hiatus left by the traditional reading. It is best removed by the change of *me* to *med*, a slighter change than *illi* to *illisce.* The form *satine* is rare in Plautus and very doubtful indeed before an initial consonant. **Capti ceperunt.** Hor. *Epp.* II. i. 156 *Graecia capta ferum uictorem cepit*, Rud. 1261 *Dum praedam habere se censeret, interim Praeda ipsus esset, praeda praedam duceret*, Petron. 89, 27, etc. **Ceperunt dolo.** Virg. *A.* ii. 196 *captique dolis.* Cf. v. 256, &c. The more usual word is the compound *decipio.*

654. **Adsimulo** normally takes Inf. as well as Acc. in Plautus; so it is possible that *sese* is a corruption of *se esse* (as in *Poen.* 996 *sese* P; cf. *Aul.* 591). But in *Truc.* 500 we have *aegram ut te adsimules* without *esse.*

[redacted]

Nuculeum amisi, reliqui pigneri putamina.
Ita mihi stolido sursum uersum os subleuere offuciis.

655. *uersum laudant Nonius p.* 157, 29 (*s. v.* putamina) 'nuculeum...putamina,' *Donatus ad Ter. Ad.* v. iii. 10: putemus] 'nucleum...putamina,' *Osbernus p.* 450 'nucleum...putamina' Nuculeum *B cum Nonio*: Nucleum *VEJ* (*ut vid.*) *cum codd. Donati* reliqui *libri cum Nonio*: retinui *Donatus* pigneri *Nonius*: pignori *libri* 656. mihi *libri* (michi *J*) uersus *VEJ* subleuere B^2 *ut vid.*: subliuere *cett.* offuciis *ex* offis- *B*: offutiis *VEJ*

655. **Nuculeus** (also *Curc.* 55), afterwards *nucleus.* **Amisi** (see note on arg. v. 7). **Reliqui,** 'I have left for myself,' as in *Stich.* 261:

> *A.* Nullan tibi lingua est? *B.* Quae quidem dicat 'dabo';
> Ventri reliqui eccam quae dicat 'cedo.'

Cf. *Curc.* 387. This use of the word is not unknown in other Latin writers, e.g. Caes. *B. G.* VII. xxxiv. 2 *equitatus partem illi attribuit, partem sibi reliquit.* Since *reliqui* is confirmed by Nonius' quotation of this passage, the *retinui* (cf. *Merc.* 592 *Spem teneo, salutem amisi*) of Donatus' quotation may be put aside, especially as the Plautine Perfect of *retineo* may have been *rettini* and not *retinui* (*Harv. Stud.* ix. 127). *Reliquit* has also been suggested, with *nuculeus* as subject. **Pigneri** (see notes on vv. 183, 433). **Putamina.** Nonius (157 M.) quotes this passage with the explanation: '*putamina*' *non solum arborum sunt, verum omnium rerum purgamenta; nam quidquid ex quacunque re proicitur,* '*putamen*' *appellatur.*

656. **Sursum uersum.** Cato *R. R.* 33. 1 *uineam sursum uorsum semper ducito.* Cf. *rursum uorsum* Amph. 1112, Epid. 248. It is more in consonance with the use of the phrase to make *versum* Adverbial (our '-wards' of 'upwards') than P.P.P. of *verto* agreeing with *os.* **Os subleuere.** Nonius (45 M. 19) *Subleuit significat inlusit et pro ridiculo habuit: tractum a genere ludi, quo dormientibus ora pinguntur.* The phrase is common in Plautus (e.g. v. 783); and the trick alluded to is described by Virgil *Ecl.* vi. 22:

> Addit se sociam timidisque supervenit Aegle,
> Aegle Naiadum pulcherrima, iamque videnti
> Sanguineis frontem moris et tempora pingit.

The reading of the MSS. *subliuere* suggests also the possibility of reading *sublinere*, an Inf. of exclamation (*os sublinere* or, putting the alliterative pair of words together, *sublinere os*), like *Curc.* 589 *Sicin mihi esse os oblitum!*, Amph. 882 *ita me probri, Stupri, dedecoris a uiro argutam meo,* Ter. *Andr.* 879 *Adeo inpotenti esse animo* (sc. *eum*). But *livi* is a recognized by-form of *levi*, and there is no necessity for departing from the MSS. Brix suggests (for the sake of Alliteration) *obleuere*, although *sublino*, not *oblino*, is Plautus' usual expression. Cf. v. 783. **Offuciis.** The word *offucia*

Hic quidem me numquam irridebit. Colaphe, Cordalio, Corax,
Ite istinc, ecferte lora. COLAPHVS. Num lignatum mittimur?

---

658. Ite *ex* Iste *V*: Iste *E* istinc *Guietus, Bothius*: istinc atque *libri* haec ferte *VJ* *pro* COLAPHVS *habent* Co *libri* (COLAPH *J*).

---

in its literal sense occurs in the Singular in *Most.* 264 (cf. note on *fucis*, v. 521).

657. **Colaphe, Cordalio, Corax,** from *κόλαφος, κορδύλη, κόραξ* (hook, handle of door, &c.), 'Cuff, Club, Hook.' We have similar fantastic names of slaves in *Rud.* 656 *ite istinc foras Turbalio, Sparax, ubi estis?*, and in Aristoph. *Ran.* 608:

> Ὁ Διτύλας χὼ Σκεβλύας χὼ Παρδόκας,
> Χωρεῖτε δευρὶ καὶ μάχεσθε τουτῳί.

With *Cordalio* cf. *Cordalus*, the name of the 'libertus' in v. 735. *Corax* is the name of the 'mercennarius' of Eumolpus in Petron. 117.

658. The *atque* of the MSS. might be retained by changing *istinc* into *istim*, so that the line would run: *Ite istim atque ecferte*, &c. But the use of two Imperatives with Asyndeton is common in Plautus (see note on v. 950 *ite...arcessite*), and the insertion of *atque* in cases of Asyndeton is a besetting sin of copyists. Cf. *Bacch.* 1115 *Id perit cum tuo* [*atque*] *ambo aeque amicos habent*, Curc. 280 *Date uiam mihi noti* [*atque*] *ignoti*, Cist. 205 *Qui omnes homines supero* [*atque*] *antideo*, Aul. 784 *Repudium rebus paratis* [*atque*] *exornatis nuptiis.* **Istinc** means 'from the house' in the similar line, *Poen.* 1319 *ite istinc, serui, foras, Ecferte fustis.* Cf. Plaut. frag. 49 *Cilix, Lycisce, Sosio, Stiche, Parmeno, Exite et ferte* (*ecferte*?) *fustes priuos in manu.* And the question of Colaphus suggests that he was ignorant of what had happened. We must therefore suppose that Colaphus and his two companions come out of the house at Hegio's call, and have not been on the stage in the previous part of the Scene (see note on v. 551). **Num lignatum mittimur?**, 'do you want us to go and tie up faggots?' There is a joke on *fustes* and *ligna* in *Aul.* 411 *fustibus male contuderunt, Neque ligna ego usquam gentium praeberi uidi pulcrius.* The *lora* are used for tying Tyndarus' hands (vv. 659, 667). Cf. *Epid.* 683 *uincire uis? em ostendo manus. Tu habes lora.* We need not change *lignatum* to *ligatum*.

HEGIO, LORARII, TYNDARVS, ARISTOPHONTES. III. v.

HEG. Inicite huic manicas †mastigiae.
TYND. Quid hoc est negoti? quid ego deliqui? HEG. Rogas,
Sator sartorque scelerum, et messor maxume?

III. v. EGIO *J* ARISTOPHOFONTES *J* 659. nicite *c. sp. in.* V^1 (i *in marg.* V^2): Inicite (icite *in ras.*) *B* <maxumas> mas. *Spengelius Philol.* XXXVII *p.* 442: <actutum> mas. *Pylades* mastigie *B* 660. negotii *libri* (-cii *J*) 661—3. *versus laudat Nonius p.* 7, 24 (*s. v.* sartor) 'sator...maxume' 'non...rustici' 661. Sator satorque *VEJ*: Sartor sartorque *codd. mell. Nonii* (*in ceteris* Sartor satorque) scelerum (1 *e corr.*) *B* maxime *VE*

Act III. Scene v. This Scene offers the strongest possible contrast to the bustling comedy of the last. The verse now becomes the Iambic Senarius, of a type far more free from resolved syllables than the ordinary Senarius of Comedy. In fact the metre, as well as the language, of a great part of the scene has more of the tragic than the comic style. Not merely the noble sentiments of Tyndarus (vv. 682 sqq., 739 sqq.), but also the reproaches uttered by Hegio (vv. 670 sqq., 751 sqq.) are expressed in measured, sonorous verse, which is inconsistent with any extravagance of feeling or utterance. Hegio is not represented as ranting in a passionate outburst of fury. He retains the dignified bearing that he displayed in his first appearance on the stage, though in this Scene the stern side, as in Act I. Sc. ii. the humorous side, of his character is revealed. His concluding remarks in this Scene shew more sorrow than anger, and his tone throughout is one of righteous indignation, not of capricious passion.

The relation of this Scene to the last is similar to that of Sc. iii. to Sc. ii. of Act II. A change of metre (from Trochaic Septenarii to Iambic Senarii), but not a change of speakers, marks the change of Scene. At the end Tyndarus is led off to hard labour in the quarries.

659. The missing word can hardly be *maxumas* (Brix, Schoell), for the *manicae* are not chains, like the *catenae maiores* of v. 113. They are merely the *lora* of v. 658.

660. **Rogas?**, 'what a question!', a common use, e.g. *Aul.* 634 A. *Quid tibi uis reddam?* B. *Rogas?* Sometimes *rogitas* takes the place of *rogas*, e.g. *Aul.* 339 A. *Qui uero?* B. *Rogitas?* The sentence which precedes is usually a question with *quis* (*quid*, &c.), and the sentence that follows is usually a reply to this question, e.g. *Epid.* 64 A. *Amatne istam...?* B. *Rogas? Deperit.*

661. **Sartor,** the O. Lat. form of *saritor*, 'a hoer,' recurs in Varro *Men.* 564. The assonance with *sator* (*sator sartorque* is certainly the right

TYND. Non occatorem dicere audebas prius?
Nam semper occant prius quam sariunt rustici.
HEG. At<tat> ut confidenter mihi contra astitit!
TYND. Decet innocentem seruolum atque innoxium

---

662. TYND. *om. VE* (*J n. l.*) Non occatorem] Noccatorem V^1 (N *del.* V^2): Hoccatorem *E*: Occatorem *J* prius audebas dicere *codd. Nonii* 663. *post* prius 3—4 *litt. spat. VE* sariunt *Nonius*: sarriunt *libri* 664. HEG. *om. VE* (*J n. l.*) At<tat> *Hermannus apud Beckerum de com. Rom. fab. p.* 108 *fort.* mi homo contra michi *EJ* astitit *ex* ass- *B* 665. seruom *libri*: *corr. Bothius*

---

order of the words) commends the unusual metaphor to Hegio in his heated outburst, 'you sower, you—, you hoer.' That it is not the verbal noun from *sarcio*, wilfully misunderstood by Tyndarus, is clear from the rest of the line. Besides *sarcio* is not the Latin equivalent of Gk. ῥάπτω in this metaphor (see note on *sutelae* v. 692). **Messor** adds the finishing touch to *sator* and *sartor*. I doubt Morris' explanation 'reaper of the crop of punishment.'

662. The reading of the inferior MSS. is probably due to the fact that in their common original *non* was written with the usual contraction *n*, but the suprascript line to indicate the contraction was omitted. Hence *Noccatorem* V, *Hoccatorem* E, *Occatorem* J. **Audebas**, in the old sense of *audeo*, 'to have a mind to.' *Non audes*, 'won't you?,' is a common formula in requests, e.g. *Truc.* 425 *Non audes aliquid dare mihi munusculum?* The quotation of this line by Nonius makes it certain that *audebas* is right, but leaves a doubt regarding the order of the words; for our MSS. of Nonius have *prius audebas dicere.*

664 sqq. *Pseud.* 458 sqq.:

> *A.* Bene confidenterque adstitisse intellego.
> *B.* Decet innocentem qui sit atque innoxium
> Seruom superbum esse apud erum potissimum.

(See note on v. 324.)

664. **Attat** is Hermann's substitute for the scarcely metrical *at* of the MSS. (cf. *Aul.* 52 *At ut scelesta sola secum murmurat*). We might also suppose *mi homo* (which would be written in mediaeval MSS. *mihō*) to have been corrupted to *mihi.*

665. **Seruolum.** Brix retains *seruom* of the MSS. with hiatus before *atque*, a hiatus which seems scarcely legitimate. The confusion of Diminutives and Simple Nouns is so common in our MSS. as to warrant us here in reading *seruolum* (cf. *Asin.* arg. 4 *seruolo* edd., *seruo* MSS.). The Diminutive form suits the deprecatory tone of Tyndarus, who feels that he has gone too far in provoking Hegio (cf. v. 668).

Confidentem esse, suum apud erum potissimum.
HEG. Adstringite isti sultis uehementer manus.
TYND. Tuus sum: tu has quidem uel praecidi iube.
Sed quid negoti est? quam ob rem suscenses mihi?
HEG. Quia me meamque rem, quod in te uno fuit,
Tuis scelestis, falsidicis fallaciis
Delacerauisti deartuauistique opes.
Confecisti omnis res ac rationes meas:
Ita mi exemisti Philocratem fallaciis.
Illum esse seruom credidi, te liberum;
Ita uosmet aiebatis itaque nomina

---

666. aput *J* herum V^2J postissimum *J* 667. Atstringite *V*: Adstringinte *J* sultus *E*: sultis *ex* sultus *V* 668. tu has *J*: tuas *ceteri* precidi *B* (*alt.* i B^3 *ut vid. in ras.*) *VE* 669. negotii B^3V: negocii *J* obsem *E* suscenses *ex* suscensus *E*: succenses *BJ* michi *EJ* 671. falsis dicis *E* fallatiis *V*: fallatiis *ex* -tus *B* 672—3. *versus laudat Nonius p.* 95, 17 (*s. v.* deartuare) 'deartuasti...confecisti' 672. Deartuasti dilacerauisti atque opes *Nonius*: Delacerauisti deartuauistique (-aiustique *ut vid.* *E*) opes *libri* 673. omnes *BV* 674. mihi *libri* (michi *J*) exemisti B^3V^2: et emisti B^1V^1E: et emisisti *J* fallatiis *libri* (*J n. l.*) 675. Illum *ex* Ille *V* credidi te *J ut vid.*: credi te *ceteri* 676. nomina (*post.* 2 *litt. ras. et* om *e corr.*) *B*

---

669. We may either put an interrogation-mark after *est* and so resolve the line into two separate questions, or a comma (cf. v. 541). *Quam ob rem* will then represent *ob quod*, as in Ter. *Eun.* 145 *Multae sunt causae, quam ob rem cupio abducere*, it represents *ob quas*.

670. **Me meamque rem.** Cf. *Cist.* 501. **Quod** in the sense of *quoad*. Cf. *quod potero* (*Mil.* 1160, Ter. *Haut.* 416) beside *quoad potero* (Cic. *Rosc. Am.* iv. 10). *Quoad* is not unknown in Plautus, e.g. *Asin.* 296 *quo ad uires ualent.* Morris scans *quŏd* (like *cōlesco* for *coalesco*, &c.) and calls it "the monosyllabic form of *quoad*, which is regularly monosyllabic in Plautus even when written *quoad*, and occasionally in Lucretius and Horace." In *Men.* 769 *quoad* is written in the inferior MSS. *quod.* Still *quŏd in te fuit* is as permissible as *quŏd ad te attinet.*

672. **Deartuauisti.** See note on v. 641. The rival readings of Nonius and of our MSS. may go back to two ancient recensions; or the divergence may be due merely to a copyist's error. That the Nonius version (excepting *atque*) is free from error is suggested by the metrically correct discrimination of the two Perfect endings (*-asti* and *-auisti*). The *delacerauisti* of our MSS. can hardly stand, for *dilacero* is the recognized form (see note on v. 736). Schoell puts a comma after *opes* instead of after *omnes.*

676. **Aiebatis.** Both the trisyllabic (or quadrisyllabic) *aiebam* and

Inter uos permutastis. TYND. Fateor omnia
Facta esse ita ut tu dicis, et fallaciis
Abiisse eum abs te mea opera atque astutia;
An, obsecro hercle te, id nunc suscenses mihi?
HEG. At cum cruciatu maxumo id factumst tuo.
TYND. Dum ne ob male facta peream, parui existumo.
Si ego hic peribo, ast ille ut dixit non redit,

---

677. Inter *ex* Ita *E* 678. ut tu *Camerarius*: ut *libri* fallatiis *BVE*: -ciis *J* 679. Abisse *libri* astucia *B* 680. succenses *J* 681. crutiatu *E* maximo *VE* factum est *BV* (*J n. l.*) 682. existumo *Bothius*: estumo *VEJ*: estimo *B* <id> aestumo *Pylades*

---

the disyllabic *aibam* (v. 561) are used by Plautus. It is difficult to decide which is the more prevalent (see note on v. 619). Nor indeed is the possibility of a third variety *ăībam* (e.g. *Men.* 532?) excluded. The usual spelling in the MSS. is *aiebam*, whatever the scansion may be.

679. **Abiisse.** The MSS. have *abisse*, but their spelling in these forms is a very uncertain guide. Thus they offer *perissem* Aul. 669, *uĕnisse* Stich. 232 (*ueniisse* A), *perisse* Curc. 130, 133, *abisse* Merc. 223, *adisse* Aul. 815, *redisse* Stich. 507 (*rediisse* A), where the four-syllabled forms are required by the metre. In no line is the three-syllabled form of a Compound of *eo* with a Preposition required by the metre. (In *Merc.* 804 read *Rus abiisse aibant.*)

680. **Id suscenses mihi.** *Pers.* 430 *id tibi suscensui, Quia negabas*, *Most.* 1163 *Neque illi sum iratus neque quicquam suscenseo.*

681. **Cum cruciatu maxumo...tuo.** *Amph.* 793 *at cum cruciatu, nisi apparet, tuo*, 1033 *Cum cruciatu tuo istaec hodie, uerna, uerba funditas.* See note on v. 499.

682. **Existumo** for *aestumo* occurs in *Most.* 76 *Satin abiit neque quod dixi flocci existumat?* and is the probable reading in a Plautine fragment (*inc.* 29): *Rogata fuerit necne, flocci existimo*, where the MSS., as here, offer the Simple Verb (cf. *Bacch.* 1092, quoted in note on v. 691). Leo punctuates *Dum ne ob male facta, peream, parui*, &c., supposing *peream* to be mentally supplied in the dependent clause, as *periit* in v. 690.

683. **Ast,** a Conjunction found in old laws in this sense of 'if further,' e.g. Lex Serv. Tull.: *si parentem puer uerberet, ast olle plorassit, puer diuis parentum sacer esto*, and occasionally in the sense of 'if.' The recently discovered proclamation on the Ludi Saeculares has *ast quid est* for 'siquid est. In a line of Accius *Trag.* 260 R.:

<Idem> splendet saepe, ast idem nimbis interdum nigret,

[redacted]

At erit mi hoc factum mortuo memorabile,
Me meum erum captum ex seruitute atque hostibus
Reducem fecisse liberum in patriam ad patrem,
Meumque potius me caput periculo
Praeoptauisse, quam is periret, ponere.

---

684. mihi *libri* (michi *E*) memorabile (o *ex* e) *J* 685. Me *om. libri*: *add. Fleckeisenus, Bentleius* herum V^2J 686. Reduce *E* 687. pottus J^1 (*corr.* J^2) capud *E* periclo *libri* 688. Preoptauisse *B*

---

it has the sense of 'further' or 'but,' and similarly in Plaut. *Merc.* 246:

> Atque oppido hercle bene uelle illi uisus sum,
> Ast non habere cui commendarem capram.

In *Trin.* 74 it occurs, as here, in a conditional sentence:

> Aut si demutant mores ingenium tuom,
> Neque eos antiquos seruas, ast captas nouos,
> Omnibus amicis morbum tu incuties grauem.

The word is naturally rare in Plautus, since it belongs to a diction removed from colloquial language; but there seems no reason for refusing it a place in his plays. In this passage its 'raison d'être' is the appropriation of *at* to another use 'at least' (v. 684). In the Augustan poets it came into fashion again. They use it as a substitute for *at*, where the metre requires a long syllable. In the second cent. A.D. it passed into prose.

685. **Me** is omitted by the MSS. It would so easily have dropped out before *meum* (as in v. 230), that its insertion seems the best method of removing the hiatus (which may however be legitimate, Introd. ii. § 40), after *meum*. Another possibility would be the substitution of *captiuom* for *captum*.

686. The line is nearly identical with v. 43. Cf. also v. 699. The conjunction of *pater* and *patria* is much affected by Plautus, e.g. v. 384, *Men.* 1083 *et patriam et patrem*, 1090 *eandem patriam ac patrem*, Merc. 660 *Clam patrem patria hac effugiam*, Vidul. frag. xii. *quod haec nostra est patria et quod hic meus pater.*

687. **Periculo...ponere**, like *pignori ponere* (v. 655). **Potius... praeoptauisse.** The *potius* is redundant, as in v. 323, a pleonasm common in colloquial Latin. Cf. *Stich.* 80 *Si manere hic sese malint potius quam alio nubere*, Ter. *Hec.* 534 (quoted below).

688. **Praeoptauisse.** We have the scansion *prăĕŏptauisti* in *Trin.* 648:

> Praéoptauisti, amórem tuom uti uírtuti praepóneres

HEG. Facito ergo ut Acherunti clueas gloria.
TYND. Qui per uirtutem periit, at non interit.
HEG. Quando ego te exemplis excruciaro pessumis

---

689. acherunta *J* clueas B^3 *ut vid.*: ducas B^1 *ut vid. VEJ* gloriam V^2J
690. *versum laudant Nonius p.* 422, 4 (*s. v.* perire et interire) 'qui per...interit,' *Osbernus p.* 189 'quod per...interit' perit *libri*, *etiam codd. Nonii* aut *codd. deterr. Nonii* (at *codd. mell.*) 691—725. *his verbis versus terminantur in libris*: sutelas, praedicent, faxis, afforet, negotii, patria, uelim, malam, quicquam, mihi, prosunt, seruatum, meus, recte, tuo, emitteresne, responde, fidelior, nuperum, illi, petito, compedes, lapidarias, confeceris: *corr. Pylades*
691. extemplis *J* pessimis *E*: pessumus *J* excruciauero *BJ*: excrutiauero *VE* (*ex* excretiauero) pess. excr. *libri*: *transp. Camerarius*, *Bosscha* pess. cruciauero *Bothius*

---

prăeŏptares in Ter. *Hec.* 533:

Ádeon peruicáci esse animo, ut púerum praeoptarés perire
Pótius quam aduorsús lubidinem ánimi tui esset cum íllo nupta!

Cf. *volŭptatis*, &c. (Introd. ii. § 20). **Periret.** The Subjunctive regularly follows *potius quam*, &c., e.g. *Poen.* 922 *Ero uni potius intus ero odio, quam hic sim uobis omnibus*, Pseud. 554 *potius quam id non fiat ego dabo*, Ter. *Adel.* 240 *Potius quam uenias in periclum, Sannio,...diuiduom face*, &c.

689. **Acherunti.** See note on v. 998. **Clueas.** Like Gk. κλύω, 'to be spoken of,' 'to be celebrated' (cf. κλυτός, *inclutus*), was O. Lat. *clueo*, common in Plautus and other Republican poets. Its intransitive use accounts for its presence in the Second Conjugation in Latin, the Conjugation appropriate to Intransitives (cf. *pendeo* Intrans. beside *pendo* Trans., and see note on *intueor*, v. 557); also for its occasional Deponent form, e.g. *Pseud.* 918 *stratioticus homo qui cluear.* **Gloria,** Abl. of Manner.

690. **Periit...interit.** Nonius, p. 422 M.: '*perire' et 'interire' plurimum differentiae habet, quod 'perire' leuior res est et habet inuentionis spem et non omnium rerum finem.* Morris discredits this explanation: "No such difference exists in common usage between *pereo* and *intereo* or between *perimo* and *interimo*. The remark of Nonius is simply made up to suit this passage, which h only partially understood." Morris makes the two verbs synonymous, just as in English we might say 'He does not die, who dies for a good deed.' They are often combined, e.g. *perii interii* Aul. 713, Most. 1031. **At** will mean 'at least,' as in v. 684, if we punctuate after *periit* only. With a comma both before and after *periit*, it will have its ordinary sense, '*qui per virtutem* (*periit*), *periit, at non interit*' (cf. note on v. 801). **Interit** may be construed either as Pres. or as contracted Perf., *interĭt*.

691. **Exemplis...pessumis,** e.g. *Most.* 212 *Perii hercle, ni ego illam pessumis exemplis enicasso*, Most 192, &c. *Exemplum* is often substituted

[redacted]

Atque ob sutelas tuas te morti misero,
Vel te interiisse uel periisse praedicent;
Dum pereas, nihil interdico aiant uiuere.
TYND. Pol si istuc faxis, haud sine poena feceris,
Si ille huc rebitet, sicut confido affore.
ARIST. Pro di inmortales! nunc ego teneo, nunc scio

---

692. subte(las) *ut vid. J* 693. predicent *B*: predident *VE* (*corr. ras.* predicent) 694. nichil *EJ* aiant *Fleckeisenus*: dicant *libri* (dicat J^1: -ant J^2) intererit dicant *Leo*: interdo dicant *Spengelius* 695. paena *V*: pena *E* 696. rebitet *quidam apud Pareum*: redibit et *libri* cofido *ut vid. J* affore *Pius*: afforet *libri* (*J n. l.*) 697. dii *J* immortales *BVJ*

---

in colloquial Latin for *modus* in expressions of this kind. **Excruciaro.** The MSS. have *pessumis excruciauero*, which will hardly scan (Introd. iii. § 9). Alliteration is so favourite an ornament of Plautus that the change to *pessumis cruciauero* is not satisfactory. Cf. *Bacch.* 1092 *Omnibus exemplis excrucior* (where the inferior MSS. offer *crucior*). Verb-forms in *-aro*, &c. are usually written in the Palatine MSS. in the full form *-avero*, &c.

692. **Sutelas.** Fest. p. 448 Th. '*Sutelae*' *dolosae astutiae a similitudine suentium dictae sunt.* The word recurs in *Cas.* 95 *Possisne necne clam me sutelis tuis Praeripere Casinam uxorem.* We have *consuti doli* in *Amph.* 367, *Pseud.* 540. **Morti misero,** like Virgil's *demisere neci* (*A.* ii. 85), Ovid's *corpora leto missa* (*Fast.* ii. 964). *Morti dare* is used in *Merc.* 472 *me toxico morti dabo.*

694. The substitution of *dico* for *aio* is so frequent in our MSS., e.g. *Men.* 1046 (cf. note on v. 72), that we may suppose it to be the fault in the reading of the MSS. *interdico dicant* in this line. Leo pr fers to leave *dicant* and change *interdico* to *intererit.* Spengel's suggestion of *interdo*, a supposed Active of *interest*, is more attractive. We have the form *interduo* (cf. *creduo* beside *credo*) in Plaut. frag. inc. ii. *ciccum non interduo*, and its Optative in *Rud.* 580 *Eluas tu an exunguare ciccum non interduim*, Trin. 994 *Ceterum qui sis, qui non sis, floccum non interduim.*

695. **Faxis...feceris.** The two forms are again treated as equivalents in Plaut. *Fretum*, frag. 76:

> Nunc illud est quod responsum Arreti ludis magnis dicitur:
> Peribo si non fecero, si faxo uapulabo.

697. **Teneo.** See note on v. 10.

Quid hoc sit negoti. meus sodalis Philocrates
In libertate est ad patrem in patria. bene est,
Nec <usquam> quisquam est mi, aeque melius cui uelim.
Sed hoc mihi aegre est, me huic dedisse operam malam,
Qui nunc propter me meaque uerba uinctus est.
HEG. Votuin te quicquam mi hodie falsum proloqui?

---

698. Quod *VE* hoc sit *Bothius*: sit hoc *libri* negotii *libri* (*B ex corr.*) 699. patria *ex* pr- *B* 700. <usquam> *addidi* <domo> Benest *Schoellius* quicquam V^1 (*corr.* V^2) mihi *libri* (michi *J*) aequae *V* 701. michi *J* egre *VEJ* dixis *ante* dedisse *m.* 1, *del. in E* 703. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 619 'notaui...proloqui' Votauin V^2J quicquam *ex* quii- *ut vid. B*: quiquam V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* mihi *libri* (michi *J*)

---

698. **Quid hoc sit.** This transposition of the reading of the MSS. *quid sit hoc* is required by the metre, for *sit* is a long syllable in Plautus (Introd. ii. § 1). Besides, *quid hoc*, *quid illuc*, *quid istuc* normally are undivided word-groups in Plautus, e.g. *Men.* 384 *quid hŏc sit negoti*, Poen. 1250 *Quid hŏc sit negoti.*

699. **Ad** for *apud*. Cf. ad v. 49. **Bene est,** with Superl. *optume est* (v. 706). See note on v. 10.

700. **Usquam quisquam** is a common phrase of Plautus, often corrupted by scribes to *quisquam* alone, owing to the similar ending of the two words. It is possible that the same thing has taken place in this line. Schoell adds *domo* after *patria*, comparing *Merc.* 831, *Stich.* 506 for the phrase *patria domus*, and making this line begin with *Bene est.* Yet the loss of *domo* is not easy to account for. The MSS. have departed from the original division of the lines after v. 690, so that it is impossible to say whether the line began with *bene est* or with *nec.* **Aeque melius,** a patch-work of the two possible expressions 'equally well' and 'better,' which is characteristic of colloquial diction. Similar phrases in Plautus are *Cas.* 860, *Mil.* 551, &c. (cf. ad v. 828).

702. It was Philocrates, not Tyndarus, to whom Hegio addressed the words of v. 264 (*Quarum rerum te falsilocum mi esse nolo.* But it would be hypercritical to accuse Plautus of inconsistency on this account.

703. **Votuin,** 'did not I forbid?' "This is always the effect of *ne* with 1st sing. perf. indic., except *Cist.* 295 *dixin ego istaec, obsecro?* so with *sumne*, with *estne* in certain forms of question, and in some other sentences." Morris.

[redacted]

TYND. Vot[a]uisti. HEG. Cur es ausus mentiri mihi?
TYND. Quia uera obessent illi cui operam dabam:
Nunc falsa prosunt. HEG. At tibi oberunt. TYND.
Optumest.
At erum seruaui, quem seruatum gaudeo,
Cui me custodem addiderat erus maior meus.
Sed malene id factum tu arbitrare? HEG. Pessume.

---

704. Votuisti *Pareus* cū *E* 706. optume est *B* 707. Ad *V*[1] (*corr. V*[2]) *E* herum *V*[2]*J* gaudeo (gaud *in* 3 *litt. ras. B*[3]) *B* 708. seruatum *post* custodem *del. m.* 1 *in E* herus *V*[2]*J* 709. tu *Pylades*: *om. libri* arbitrare factum *Camerarius* factum <esse> *Bentleius* (*cf. Muellerus Pros.* p. 489) factum id *Geppertus*

---

704. Since *uotuin* is the traditional form in the preceding line, suspicion attaches to the reading *uotauisti* (to be scanned *uotăuisti*, by the Brevis Brevians Law, Introd. ii. § 20) or *uotasti* in this line. *Vetavi* however is a Latin by-form of *vetui* (Persius v. 90). **Mentiri mihi.** This construction recurs in *Amph.* 468, Ter. *Eun.* 703, but *apud te* in *Poen.* 152, *te aduorsum* Aul. 690, *aduorsum se* Mil. 1079. The verb is generally used absolutely.

706. **Nunc**, 'as things are.' Since *nunc*, *non*, *nam* are often confused in MSS. (see note on v. 185), some suppose that the true reading is *nam falsa prosunt*, or better, *non falsa prosunt?*, a question, 'is not dishonesty the better policy here?'

707. **Seruatum gaudeo**, a common construction. In *Curc.* 314 it gives occasion for a pun:

A. *facite uentum ut gaudeam.*
B. *Maxume.* A. *Quid facitis, quaeso?* B. *Ventum.*

"Plautus also constructs *gaudeo* with inf. (*Mil.* 899), acc. and inf. (*Bacch.* 456), *quom* and indic. (*Amph.* 681), *quia* (*Amph.* 958), *si* and indic. (*Trin.* 53), acc. neut. pronoun (842 below), and abl. (*Poen.* 197)." Hallidie.

708. **Erus maior** and **erus minor** were household words. Cf. *Bacch.* 642 *Erum maiorem meum ut ego hodie lusi lepide*, Truc. 308 *Ni ego uostra ero maiori facta denarrauero*, 796 *era maior mea*, Pseud. 1268 *Hoc ego modo atque erus minor hunc diem sumpsimus prothyme*, Merc. 112 *Erus ut minor opera tua seruetur*, Truc. 797 *era med orauit minor.* The Comparative follows the Noun in this phrase (see note on v. 762). **Custodem addiderat**, the usual verb. Cf. *Mil.* 550, *Aul.* 556, Virg. *A.* vi. 777, &c.

709. The MSS. have *Sed malene id factum arbitrare?* The defect in the metre may be remedied in various ways. Bentley proposed the insertion of *esse* after *factum*, although with *arbitror* we find *esse* as often absent as

TYND. At ego aio recte, qui abs te sorsum sentio.
Nam cogitato, si quis hoc gnato tuo
Tuus seruus faxit, qualem haberes gratiam?

---

present in Plautus (cf. *Mil.* 1415 *iureque id factum arbitror*, Aul. 418 *istud male factum arbitror*, Amph. 48 *Gratum arbitratur esse id a uobis sibi*). In *Pseud.* 1105, a bacchiac line, it has been wrongly inserted by the MSS.: *Nam quí líberós* [*esse*] *ilicó se arbitrántur.* The least change of the traditional text would be to transpose *arbitrare factum* or *factum id.* But the *ego* of v. 710 seems to call for *tu* in this line. The Pronoun may easily have dropped out after *-tum* of *factum*, just as it has done after *lautum* in *Rud.* 701 *Sí quíppiamst minus quód bene esse laútum* <*tu*> *arbitráre* (*lautu* MSS.). In *Men.* 744 the MSS. offer a defective iambic senarius with *arbitror*:

Quem tu hominem arbitrere nescio,

where the Pronoun *me* (*med*) is clearly required: *Quem tu hominem med arbitrere nescio* (*esse me arb.* Seyffert). The same Pronoun has been omitted by the Ambrosian Palimpsest, but retained by the other MSS. in *Pers.* 349 *Non sum neque me esse arbitror* (*neque esse* A). **Malene.** Ritschl (*Opusc.* ii. 560) proposed to spell *maline*, *benine*, &c., after the pattern of *haecine* from *haec*(*e*), *sicine* from *sic*(*e*), *hoccine* from *hocc*(*e*), &c. But though the MSS. give indications of the spellings *seruirin* (*Men.* 795) for *seruire-ne*, *facilin* (*Men.* 928) for *facile-ne*, they give none of the change of the final ĕ (originally ē) of *male*, *bene* before the Interrogative Enclitic.

710. **At ego aio recte.** So in v. 72. **Sorsum** (cf. *Epid.* 402: in Ter. *Adel.* 971 spelt *seorsum*, though a disyllable) for *sē-vorsum.* The loss of *v* is more natural between two similar vowels, e.g. *prorsus* for *prō-vorsus*, *sis* for *si vis.* **Abs te sorsum sentio.** Afran. *Com.* 85 R. *abs te sēorsus sentiam.* Without *sorsum*, the words *abs te sentio* might mean 'I think with you,' e.g. *Rud.* 1100:

A. Omnia istaec ego facile patior, dum hic hinc a me sentiat.
B. At qui nunc abs te stat, uerum hinc cibit testimonium,

though the usual expression is *tecum* (*Most.* 927 *tecum sentio*, Pseud. 958 *tecum sentio*, Ter. *Andr.* 324 *haud mecum sentit*), whence was evolved the compound *consentio.*

711. **Cogitato.** The Fut. Imperat. of this verb (or in periphrasis *facito ut cogites*, *facito cogites*) is more usual in Plautus than the Pres. Imperat., probably owing to the notion of futurity contained in the verb itself. So we should not change *cogitato* to *cogita tu.*

712. **Faxit,** Optative of S-Aorist (cf. ad vv. 149, 172), here used in the protasis of a Conditional sentence, as often in Plautus and the older literature, e.g. *Aul.* 228 *si locassim*, Lex Numae (ap. Fest. 194. 21 Th.) *si*

[redacted]

Emitteresne necne eum seruum manu?
Essetne apud te is seruos acceptissimus?
Responde. HEG. Opinor. TYND. Cur ergo iratus mihi es?
HEG. Quia illi fuisti quam mihi fidelior.
TYND. Quid? tu una nocte postulauisti et die
Recens captum hominem, nuperum, nouicium,
Te perdocere ut melius consulerem tibi
Quam illi quicum una a puero aetatem exegeram?

---

713. e. seruum tuum manu *V* 714. aput *J* seruos *J*: seruus *ceteri* acceptissimus] *J n. l.* 715. oppinor *E*: opinior J^1 (*corr.* J^2) ingratus *J* michi *J* 717—8. *versus laudant Nonius p.* 148, 10 (*s. v.* nuperum) 'quid tu...nouicium,' *Osbernus p.* 376 'postulauisti hominem nuperum atque nouicium' Quod *E* diem V^1 (*corr.* V^2) 718. *versum laudat Priscianus inst.* III *p.* 96, 3 *H.* 'recens...nouicium' captum (t *ex* s) *E* nuperum nouicium *Nonius*: nuperum et nouicium *Priscianus*: et nouicium (*om.* nuperum *in fine v.*) B^1VE (*nisi quod* nouicium *ex* nouicinum *ut vid. ras. B*, -tium *VE*): nuper et nouicium B^3J *ut vid.* (*an* nuperum?) 720. a *Pylades*: *om. libri* etatem *BE* exegeram (egera B^2 *ut vid. in ras.*): exaegeram *J*

---

hominem fulminibus occisit. I doubt the existence of an E-Subjunctive form *faxet*, which Fleckeisen would read here.

713. This verse is put by some editors after v. 714. The similar beginning of the two lines would make them liable to be transposed by copyists. **Emitteres...manu.** See note on v. 408.

717. **Quid? tu una,** &c. Seyffert prefers the punctuation *quid tu? una*, &c., as in *Mil.* 961 *Quid ea? ingenuan an festuca facta e serua liberast?* **Postulauisti,** 'expect,' a weakened sense of the word that is common in colloquial Latin, e.g. vv. 186, 739.

718. **Nuperum** Adj., from *novus* and *paro*, 'newly acquired.' The Adverb *nuper* is either the Nom. Sing. Masc. of this O. Lat. Adj. or the Acc. Sing. Neut. of a by-form, an I-stem, for *nuperĕ*. I suppose the two adjectives *nuperum* and *nouicium* to stand in Asyndeton, a common feature of Early Latin diction (cf. v. 722). It is particularly common with pairs of Adjectives which are placed for emphasis after the Noun, e.g. v. 406, Mil. 663 *aduocato tristi, iracundo*, Most. 730 *piscatu probo, electili*, Pseud. 697 *aliquem hominem strenuom, Beneuolentem.*

719. **Te perdocere.** See note on v. 739.

720. **A puero.** In some archetype of our MSS. *a* was lost after *una* (cf. *quia stant* for *quia astant* v. 2). **Quicum una...aetatem exegeram.** *Trin.* 15 *Dedi ei meam gnatam, quicum aetatem exigat*, 953 *quicum aetatem*

HEG. Ergo ab eo petito gratiam istam. Ducite,
Ubi ponderosas, crassas capiat conpedes.
Inde ibis porro in latomias lapidarias.
Ibi quom alii octonos lapides effodiunt, nisi
Cotidiano sesqueopus confeceris,
'Sescentoplago' nomen indetur tibi.

---

721. abeo *ex* habeo *V*: habeo *J* gratiam istam *Pylades*: istam gratiam *libri* 722. compedes *BJ*: c̄pedes *E* 723. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 329 'ibis...lapidarias' latomias *ex* -iam *ut vid. E* 724. Ibi *add.* B^3 cum V^2J octonos (octo *add.* B^3, *qui etiam* n *alt. supra* n *scripsit et verba in* octo nos *disj.*) *B* 725. Cotidiano *Gulielmius Qu. in Capt. p.* 357 *ex libris, Lipsius ad Tac. Ann.* IV *p.* 115: Cotidianos *libri* esque-opus V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* cum feceris V^1 (*corr.* V^2): quem feceris *J* 726. Sex-centoplago *J* uidetur *E ut vid. J*

---

exegerim, Mil. 1275 *tecum uiuere uolt atque aetatem exigere*, Cist. 77 *quicum aetatem degerem.*

721. **Petito**, 'you may seek,' a Future Imperative. Cf. *Men.* 727 *Mea quidem hercle causa uidua uiuito*, 1029 *Mea quidem hercle causa liber esto atque ito quo uoles.* **Ducite.** Cf. ad v. 733.

722. **Ponderosas crassas.** Cf. note on v. 718.

723. **Latomias.** The usual Latin form of Gk. λατομία is *lautumia*, which occurs in *Poen.* 827:

> Ita me di ament, uel in lautumiis, uel in pistrino mauelim
> Agere aetatem praepeditus latere forti ferreo,
> Quam apud lenonem hunc seruitutem colere.

We have *lapicidinae* in vv. 736, 944, 1000. **Lapidarias.** The Adj. is added, according to Fleckeisen, to distinguish the place of labour from the prison quarries (of Syracuse, &c.).

724. **Quom...effodiunt.** See note on v. 255.

725. **Cotidiano**, an unusual form of *cotidie*. Afran. *Com.* 370 R. *cotidiano in rebus maximis Propositis.* The form occurs in Cicero *Verr.* II. iv. 8. 18. **Sesqueopus.** If the ordinary explanation of *sesqui-* as *semis-que* (cf. *sestertius* for *semis-tertius*) be right, there is no reason why the spelling of the MSS. here should not be retained (but *sesquipede* Trin. 903, with *e* changed to *i* before a consonant). The word must be pronounced as a trisyllable *sesqu'opus*, for a short vowel in the interior of a word or word-group is not left in hiatus (e.g. *suav'olens*, &c.). (Horace's *male†ominatis*, C. iii. 14. 11 is an extremely doubtful exception.)

726. **Sescentoplago.** For the use of *sescenti* for an indefinitely large number cf. *Aul.* 320 *Sescenta sunt quae memorem*, &c.

[redacted]

ARIST. Per deos atque homines ego te obtestor, Hegio,
Ne tu istunc hominem perduis. HEG. Curabitur;
Nam noctu neruo uinctus custodibitur,
Interdius sub terra lapides eximet.
Diu ego hunc cruciabo, non uno absoluam die.

---

727. te ego *E* obtestor *ex* obsteor *ut vid. J* egio *J* 728. istuc B^1 (*corr.* B^2 *ut vid.*): istunt *V*: istunc (c *ex* t *ras.*) *E* perduis *ex* perdius *V* vv. 729—745 *his voc. terminantur in libris*: eximet, istuc, fabrum, meum, siet, sit, postulem, in morte, tamen, mihi, uale: *corr. Pylades* 729. nocte *J ante corr.* 730. Interdiu *VEJ* eximet *add.* B^3 *ut vid.* 731. ego hunc ς, *Pylades*: hunc ego *libri* (hunc ergo *J*) crutiabo *VE*: cruciabo *ex* cruabo *J*

---

727. For the form of adjuration see note on v. 977.

728. **Perduis.** The Latin 'Subjunctive' forms in *-im*, *sim* (older *siem*), *velim*, *edim*, &c. are relics of the Optative Mood. Thus *edim*, *creduim* (from *duo*, a by-form both of *do*, 'to give,' and *-do*, 'to put') were originally Optatives, while *edam*, *creduam* were Subjunctives. In Plautus the distinction is already to a great extent lost. *Duim*, *perduim* are however found mainly in prayers and execrations, thus retaining their Optative character. *Duim* was the form appropriate to Early Latin prayers, as in the prayer of the 'agri lustratio' preserved by Cato (*R. R.* cxli. 3): *pastores pecuaque salua seruassis duisque bonam salutem ualetudinemque mihi domo familiaeque nostrae*; it is used even in Tiberius' letter to the Senate (Tac. *Ann.* iv. 38). **Curabitur,** ironical. Cf. v. 737. "Hegio ironically takes *perduis* in the sense of 'lose.'" Hallidie.

729. **Neruo.** "The *neruos* of Plautus was a wooden instrument confining the neck, weighing something like fifteen Roman pounds." (Allen in *Harvard Studies* vii. 60.) Cf. Festus, p. 164. 23 Th. *Nervum appellamus etiam ferreum vinculum quo pedes inpediuntur, quamquam Plautus eo etiam cervices vinciri ait*; XII Tab. *ni iudicatum facit...secum ducito, uincito aut neruo aut compedibus, quindecim pondo ne maiore, aut, si uolet, minore uincito*, *Aul.* 743, *Curc.* 689, 720, 723, *Poen.* 1269, 1365 *ut sis apud me lignea in custodia*, 1399, 1409, *Rud.* 872, 876, 887, frag. XXX., Ter. *Phorm.* 325, 695.

730. **Interdius** from O. Lat. *dius*, 'by day' (*Merc.* 862 *noctu neque dius*), a by-form of O. Lat. *diu*, 'by day' (*Cas.* 823 *noctuque et diu*), is not uncommon in the Republican writers, e.g. *Aul.* 72, *Rud.* 7, Cato *R. R.* 83. We find the same by-form of *diu*, 'for a long time,' on plebeian inscriptions (*quandius* C. I. L. vi. 6308, *quamdius* vi. 13101).

731. **Ego hunc.** The MSS. have *hunc ego*, but the change improves the rhythm of the line. Besides, the Nom. of a Pers. Pron. normally

ARIST. Certumne est tibi istuc? HEG. Non moriri certius.
Abducite istum actutum ad Hippolytum fabrum,
Iubete huic crassas compedes inpingier;
Inde extra portam ad meum libertum Cordalum
In lapicidinas facite deductus siet:
Atque hunc me uelle dicite ita curarier,
Ne qui deterius huic sit quam cui pessume est.

---

732. cercius *B*: certius *cum* 4—5 *litt. spat. E* 733. yppolitum *libri* 734. impingier *J* 735. cordalium V^2J 736. lapidicinas *J* diductus *libri* (ded- V^2J) 737. me uelle dicite ita *Fleckeisenus*: ita me uelle dicite (ducite *V ante corr. E*) *libri* 738. quid *VEJ*

---

precedes a Demonstrative in Plautus (see note on v. 349). **Absoluam.** *Epid.* 466 *te absoluam breui*, Aul. 517 *iam hosce absolutos censeas.*

733. **Abducite**, as in vv. 746, 749. In v. 721 Geppert proposes to change *ducite* of the MSS. into *abducite.*

734. **Huic** (cf. vv. 737, 738), but *istum* in v. 733. At this line Hegio crosses the stage and stands beside Tyndarus (see note on v. 293). **Compedes** "are shackles for the leg (*crura*, *Capt.* 652; *suram*, *Pseud.* 1176), of iron (*ferreas*, *Pers.* 573), put on by a smith (*Capt.* 733, 1027), and worn constantly (*Cist.* 244), so that they [are said to] shine through friction (*rediget in splendorem compedes*, *Aul.* 602). It is possible to move about and work in them (*Capt.* 723 sq., 736, 944), but their weight (ten pounds, Liv. xxxii. 26; fifteen pounds, XII. Tables) effectually prevents escape. They consist (*Men.* 85 f.) of a ring (*anus*) fastened with a rivet (*clavos*), and putting them on is called *impingere* (*Capt.* 733, *Pers.* 269, 573). They clank as one walks (*tintinnabant compedes* Naevius 114 R. = Fest. p. 364 M.), which shows that they are connected by a chain. Those who wear them are *tintinnaculi uiri* (*Truc.* 782)." (Allen in *Harvard Studies* vii. p. 41.)

735. **Cordalum.** Cordalio is the name of one of the *lorarii* (v. 657).

736. **Deductus.** We need not hesitate to change *diductus* of the MSS., the prefixes *de-* and *di-* are so readily confused in MSS. (cf. note on v. 672).

737. The MSS. put *ita* after *hunc.* Perhaps the word was lost through Haplography (*dicite ita*) and then set in the margin from which it found its way into the wrong part of the line.

738. **Ne qui**, the reading of *B*, is on its own account to be preferred to *ne quid*, the reading of the other MSS., for *qui* is appropriate to sentences with a Comparative, e.g. *Aul.* 16 *Coepi obseruare ecqui maiorem filius Mihi*

TYND. Cur ego te inuito me esse saluom postulem?
Periclum uitae meae tuo stat periculo.
Post mortem in morte nihil est quod metuam mali.
Etsi peruiuo usque ad summam aetatem, tamen
Breue spatium est perferundi quae minitas mihi.

---

739. saluum *ex* saluom *ut vid.* *J*: saluum *ceteri* 740. Periculum *libri*: *corr. Pylades* 741. inmortem *ut vid.* *E* nichil *EJ* quid *E* mali (a *ex* e) *E* 742. Etsi superuiuo *B*: Etsi peruiuo *ras. ex* et superuiuo *E* etatem *E* 743. spacium *B* michi *E*

---

honorem haberet, Rud. 891 *si qui...citius*, Trin. 120 *siqui probiorem*, and the common phrase *numqui minus*. The words *qui* and *quid* are often confused in the MSS. and the decision between them is often difficult (e.g. *Mil.* 1106, 1111 *ecquid fortis* and *ecqui fortis*). **Cui pessume est.** This is a Latin mannerism of expression. Cf. phrases like *sit pro praetore eo iure quo qui optimo.* **Deterius** is of course ironical.

739. **Me esse...postulem,** a common construction with *postulo*, as with *volo*. Cf. v. 719, *Cas.* 141 *Nunc ne tu te mihi respondere postules.*

740. **Periclum...periculo** (Abl. of Price). The termination *-clum* was originally monosyllabic (I.-Eur. *-tlom*), but developed in time a parasitic vowel and became disyllabic. Plautus uses the expanded forms as a rule (especially when a long vowel precedes) only at the end of a line or hemistich; that is to say, he regards the equivalence of the parasitic vowel to an actual short syllable as a licence only to be resorted to in cases of metrical necessity. It is only at the end of a line that the phrase *nullum periclumst* (e.g. *Pseud.* 1076) becomes *nullum periculumst* (e.g. *Capt.* 91). *Cubiculum*, however, always or almost always appears as a quadrisyllable. Brix favours *stat tuo*, which leaves the ictus on the Possessive Pronoun.

742. **Etsi...tamen.** For the position of the words cf. Ter. *Haut.* 225 *Hic Clinia, etsi is quoque suarum rerum sat agitat tamen Habet bene et pudice eductam.* We sometimes find *tamen* at the end of one line immediately followed by *etsi* at the beginning of the next, e.g. *Cas.* 954 *uapulo hercle ego inuitus tamen, Etsi malum merui*, Mil. 1209 *postremo tamen, Etsi istuc mihi acerbumst.*

743. **Spatium...perferundi.** *Aul.* 806 *spatium ei dabo exquirendi meum factum.* In the Nominative the Gerundive is normal in Plautus, in the Gen. and Dat. the Gerund. *Trin.* 869 is exceptional: *Hercle opinor mi aduenienti hac noctu agitandumst uigilias.* **Minitas.** The Active form recurs in *Amph.* frag. v. *Quid minitabas te facturum, si istas pepulissem fores?*, but the Deponent is normal in Plautus (e.g. v. 963).

Vale atque salue, etsi aliter ut dicam meres.
Tu, Aristophontes, de me ut meruisti, ita uale;
Nam mihi propter te hoc optigit. HEG. Abducite.
TYND. At unum hoc quaeso, si huc rebitet Philocrates,
Vt mi eius facias conueniundi copiam.
HEG. Periistis, nisi hunc iam e conspectu abducitis.
TYND. Vis haec quidem hercle est, et trahi et trudi simul.—
HEG. Illic est abductus recta in phylacam, ut dignus est.

---

745. meruisti isti ita *E* ita uale *add. B*[2] *ut vid.* 746. obtigit *B* 747. At *ex* Atque *ras. B*: Aut *J* unum (*alt.* u *ex* n *ut vid.*) *B* queso *libri* huc *om. J* rubitet *VE ut vid.* 748. mihi *libri* conueniundi, iu *ex* ie *B*, *ex* icu *E* 749. Peristis *libri* iam hunc *Pylades*: istunc iam *Bachius in Studemundi Stud. t.* II *p.* 242 751. HEG. *add. V*[2] philacam *libri* (-tam *J*)

---

744. **Etsi** in such a context acquires the force of Gk. καίτοι. Cf. *Trin.* 593, *Pers.* 601. **Ut dicam meres**, as in v. 422, &c.

747. **Unum hoc.** This is the normal order in Terence. In Plautus *hic* may precede (e.g. v. 241) or follow *unus*.

748. **Facias conueniundi copiam.** The phrase *copiam facere* (cf. v. 373, &c.) is followed by the Genitive of the Gerund in *Pers.* 539 *Ut tibi recte conciliandi primo facerem copiam.*

749. **Periistis,** often with the addition of *iam*, e.g. *Mil.* 828 *periisti iam, nisi uerum scio*, Poen. 355 *Iam hercle tu periisti, nisi illam mihi tam tranquillam facis.* **Nisi hunc,** to be scanned with Hiatus (Introd. ii. § 40), which would be removed by the transposition *iam hunc* or by the substitution of *istunc* (see note on v. 734) for *hunc*, or by the insertion of *hinc* after *hunc.*

750. **Vis haec quidem hercle est,** a current phrase. Cf. Ter. *Adel.* 943 *uis est haec quidem*, Cic. *Amic.* viii. 26 *vim hoc quidem est afferre.* Suetonius (*Caes.* 82) tells us that Julius Caesar, when the conspirators attacked him, cried out *ista quidem vis est.* With these words Tyndarus is removed into the house.

751. **Illic est** is probably to be scanned *illĭc ĕst* (dactyl; see note on v. 8), rather than *illicst* (Introd. ii. § 12). Skutsch favours *ill'c est* (cf. Introd. ii. § 14). **Recta.** *Mil.* 491 *hic ad me recta habet rectam uiam*, *Pseud.* 1136. Often *recta uia*, e.g. *Cas.* 881 *recta uia in conclaue abduxi.* **Phylacam.** The word does not occur elsewhere in Plautus.

[redacted]

Ego illis captiuis aliis documentum dabo,
Ne tale quisquam facinus incipere audeat.
Quod absque hoc esset, qui mihi hoc fecit palam,
Usque offrenatum suis me ductarent dolis.
Nunc certum est nulli posthac quicquam credere.
Satis sum semel deceptus. Speraui miser
Ex seruitute me exemisse filium:
Ea spes elapsa est. Perdidi unum filium,
Puerum quadrimum quem mihi seruos surripuit,
Neque eum seruom umquam repperi neque filium;
Maior potitus hostium est. quod hoc est scelus?

---

752. captiuus *J*: captis *Camerarii manu in B* 753. Natale *VE* incipere (c *ex* p) *B* 754. michi *EJ* 755. offrenatum *Gulielmius Veris.* III 1 *p.* 299 *itemque Acidalius*: ofere natum *B*: offere gnatum *V*: offerre natum *EJ* 756. posthac *Bothius ex Guelf.*: posthaec *libri* 757. deceptis V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* 758. seruite (e *alt. in* 3 *litt. ras.*) *B*: seruitute *ex* eru- *V* me *om. J* 759. spes *in ras. B* elabsa *ex* elapsa *B* 760. miohi *J* seruos *J*: -uus *cett.* subr. *E* 761. seruum (*ex* -uom *ut vid.*) *B*: seruom *J*: seruum *ceteri* unquam *B* reperi *J* repperi umquam *E* nec *J* 762. *versum hunc laudare videtur Nonius p.* 498, 25 (*genetivus pro ablativo*) 'ille alter potitus hostis est' potitus *B in ras.* quid *J*

---

754. **Quod,** as in *quodsi.* **Absque hoc esset.** The Preposition *ab* augmented by the Particle *-sĕ* of Gk. ἐκεῖ-σε, &c. became *abs* (Gk. ἄψ). In the O. Lat. phrase *absque me* &c. *esset* (*foret*) this *abs* seems to be joined to the Indefinite Particle *que* that appears in *quandoque*, 'whenever,' &c., so that the phrase literally means 'if ever it were apart from me.' At a later period *absque me* &c. was used without the verb, and *absque* came to take the sense of *sine*, 'without.'

759. **Elapsa est.** The word is used of an eel in *Pseud.* 747 *anguilast, elabitur*, 'he slips through your fingers like an eel.'

760. **Surripuit,** here pronounced (but probably not spelt by Plautus) as a trisyllable, *surpuit.* (See note on v. 8.)

762. **Maior** (*filius*) (cf. *Poen.* 1156, *Stich.* 66), like *minor filius* (v. 952: cf. *Poen.* prol. 102). The Comparative precedes *filius, filia.* (See note on v. 708.) **Potitus hostium est.** See note on v. 92. **Quod hoc est scelus?** Ter. *Eun.* 326 *Quid hoc est sceleris? perii* (in same sense as *Adel.* 544 *Quid hoc, malum, infelicitatis?*), *Men.* 322 *Quod te urget scelus?*. Similarly the Adj. *scelestus* is used in the sense of 'God-forsaken,' e.g. *Most.* 563 *ne ego sum miser, Scelestus, natus dis inimicis omnibus.* There is a pun on the two senses of *scelestus* in *Asin.* 476 *Sceleste, non audes*

Quasi in orbitatem liberos produxerim.
Sequere hac: reducam te ubi fuisti. Neminis
Miserere certum est, quia mei miseret neminem.—
ARIST. Exauspicaui ex uinclis. nunc intellego

763. filios *J* perduxerim *VE* (*ex* perduxex-) *J* *vv.* 764—767 *his voc. terminantur in libris*: certum est, uinculis, denuo: *corr. Pylades* 765. *versum laudant Nonius p.* 143, 14 (*s. v.* 'neminis') 'neminis...neminem,' *Cominianus apud Charisium* II *p.* 159, 33 = *Diomedes* I *p.* 333, 33 = *Excerpta ex cod. Bob.* 561, 17 *K.* 'neminis...neminem,' *Charisius* I *p.* 138, 7 *K.* 'neminis misereri certum est,' *Priscianus inst.* II *p.* 106, 7 *H.* 'neminis...nemo.' Miserere *Spengelius ad Truc.* II 1, 13 (223): Misereri *libri* (Mifereri *E*) *cum grammaticis* (me miseret *codd. Nonii*) est *om. codd. Prisciani* qua me *codd. Diom.* (qui me): nam me *codd. Nonii*: quia (*om.* mei) B^1 nemine *cod. Charis.*: nemo *codd. Prisciani* 766. ARIST. *Pylades*: *Hegioni continuant libri* *verba* exauspicaui ex uinculis *om. B* Exauspicaui *ex* Exauspiscaui *E* uinculis *libri*: *corr. Lambinus* intelligo *J*

mihi scelesto subuenire? We may translate the phrase in this line by a line of Shadwell's *Squire of Alsatia* (Act IV. Sc. i.), "What have I done that Heaven should thus afflict me?" (Cf. Virg. *A.* vii. 307.)

763. **Produxerim.** *Asin.* 544 *audientem dicto, mater, produxisti filiam*, *Rud.* 1173 *ego is sum qui te produxi pater*, Ter. *Adel.* 314 *qui illud produxit scelus.*

764. **Neminis**, instead of the usual *nullius*. The Abl. *nemine* (usually *nullo*) is found in *Cist.* 89, *Mil.* 1062.

765. **Miserere.** This form is required by the metre in *Truc.* 223, though the MSS. (*AP*) there, as here, offer *misereri*:

Piaculumst miserere nos hominum rei male gerentum,

and since there is some slight manuscript evidence for it in this line, we may accept it here too. In *Pseud.* 378 editors vary between *misereri* and *miserere*. The juxtaposition of Active and Deponent forms of the same verb is however not unknown, e.g. *paciscor* and *pacisco* in *Bacch.* 865—6 (cf. Naevius *Bell. Pun.* ap. Non. p. 474 M.). **Mei.** The Early Latin Genitive *mis* is substituted by some. It is true that *mis* and *tis*, when they occur in Plautus or other early writers, are again and again changed to *mei* and *tui*. For this line however we have the additional evidence of Priscian and Nonius, and although the evidence varies in certain particulars, there is no suggestion of the form *mis*.

Hegio enters the house, followed (at v. 767) by Aristophontes.

766. This and the concluding line of the Scene would probably in an English Comedy make a rhymed couplet. **Exauspicaui.** The verb *auspico* is always Active in Plautus (*Pers.* 689 *Lucro faciundo ego auspicaui in hunc diem*, Rud. 717, *Stich.* 502 *Eā ego auspicauin in re capitali mea?*).

[redacted]

Redauspicandum esse in catenas denuo.—

ERGASILVS parasitus. IV. i.

Iuppiter supreme, seruas me measque auges opes,

---

767. Redauspicandum (spi *e corr.*) *B*.
IV. i. PARASITVS ERGASILVS B^2: PARASITVS ERGASILOS *V*: PARASITVS ERGA ILLOS (S ERGA ILLOS *in ras.*) *E*: ERGASILVS PARASITVS *J* 768. Uppiter (*om. sp. in.*) V^1: PAR. (*ex* EPAR) *et* i V^2 suppreme *libri* (supreme *J*) measque auges *in ras. B*

---

767. **Redauspicandum** is (like *exauspicaui*) a coinage for the nonce, similar to *redambula* (v. 900), *refacere* Truc. 877 (*nefacere* edd.):

Factum cupio, nam refacere si uelim, non est locus,

recharmida Trin. 977 (*decharmida* edd.):

A. Charmides ego sum...
B. Proin tute itidem ut charmidatu's, rursum te recharmida.

Esse, more usually omitted with the Gerund and Gerundive in Plautus. But cf. *Stich.* 716 *quod faciundum uides esse tibi.* **Denuo.** Cf. ad v. 411.

Act IV. Scene i. Ergasilus comes in hot haste from the harbour where he has learnt of the return of Philocrates, Philopolemus (Hegio's son) and Stalagmus (the slave who kidnapped Tyndarus). His excitement finds metrical expression in the rapid alternation of Trochaics and Iambics (Introd. iii. § 13), vv. 768—9 Trochaic Septenarii, 770—1 Iambic Octonarii, 772 probably Trochaic Dimeter with Cretic colon, 773—4 Iambic Octonarii, 775 Trochaic Septenarius, 776—780 Iambic Octonarii.

We have a similar alternation (μεταβολή) of Trochaics and Iambics in the agitated utterances of Tyndarus (Act III. Sc. iii. and the beginning of Sc. iv.), but a closer parallel is to be found in Ter. *Eun.* III. v., where Chaerea rushes excitedly out of the house:

Núm quis hic est? némost. num quis hínc me sequitur? némo homost.
Iámne erumpere hóc licet mi gaúdium? pro Iúppiter, } (Troch. Sept.)
Nunc ést profecto intérfici quom pérpeti me póssum,
Ne hoc gaúdium contáminet uita aégritudine áliqua. } (Iamb. Sept.)
Sed néminemne cúriosum intéruenire núnc mihi,
Qui mé sequatur quóquo eam, rogitándo obtundat, énicet,
Quid géstiam aut quid laétus sim, quo pérgam, unde emergam, úbi siem
Vestítum hunc nanctus, quíd mi quaeram, sánus sim anne insániam! } (Iamb. Oct.)

768. **Iuppiter supreme.** This was apparently the current invocation

Maximas opimitates opiparasque offers mihi,
Laudem, lucrum, ludum, iocum, festiuitatem, ferias,
Pompam, penum, potationis, saturitatem, gaudium.
Nec cuiquam homini supplicare nunc certum est mihi;

---

769. *versum laudant Nonius p.* 146, 5 (*s. v.* optimitas) 'maximas...mihi,' *Osbernus p.* 390 'opes maximas opiparasque offers mihi' opimates *VE*: epimates *J*: optimitas *codd. Nonii* offert *codd. Nonii* michi *EJ* 770. Laudem (L *ex corr.*) *E* 772. *fort.* <quioquam> s. *ante* supplicare 2 *litt. ras. ut vid. in B* nunc <iam> *Geppertus* me nunc *J* michi *EJ*

---

of Jupiter Servator. Cf. v. 976, *Men.* 1114 *Iuppiter supreme, serua me* (cf. *Most.* 348). **Seruas me.** Similar expressions of thankfulness are, e.g. *Pseud.* 613 *di me seruant atque amant*, *Merc.* 966 *di me seruant.* The opposite of *servo* is *perdo*, e.g. *Rud.* 1164 A. *Di me seruatum cupiunt.* B. *At me perditum*, Cist. 573 A. *Seruate di med, obsecro.* B. *At me perditis* (cf. *Curc.* 335).

769. *Asin.* 282:

Maximas opimitates, gaudio exfertissimas,
Suis eris ille una mecum pariet, gnatoque et patri.

770. **Laudem, lucrum,** an alliterative combination. Cic. *Phil.* ii. 45. 115 *tum intelleges quantum inter lucrum et laudem intersit.*

771. **Pompam.** This word in colloquial Latin was applied to the dishes or 'courses' sent in for the table. Cf. Plaut. *Bacar.* frag. *cuius haec uentri portatur pompa?*, Stich. 683 *agite, ite foras: ferte pompam*, Petron. 60 (in the description of Trimalchio's dinner) *avidius ad pompam manus porreximus*, Mart. x. 31. 3—4 *Nec bene cenasti: mullus tibi quattuor emptus Librarum cenae pompa caputque fuit*, xii. 62. 9 *Cernis ut Ausonio similis tibi pompa macello Pendeat et quantus luxurietur honos?* The metaphor is that of Shadwell, *The Scowrers* III. i., "enter dinner in state.... I will be sewer and will march in the head of it." **Potationis** probably Acc. Pl., as is indicated by the punctuation in the Codex Vetus. Some make it Gen. Sing. (For *saturitas* used in reference to drink, see note on v. 109.)

772. Studemund may be right in retaining this line in its traditional form:

Nec cuiquam homini supplicare nunc certum est mihi,

as a Trochaic Dimeter with a Trochaic (or rather Cretic) colon. Brix follows Geppert in changing *nunc* into *nunciam.* But the word *nunciam*, a trisyllable, like *etiam*, *quoniam*, and perhaps the Plautine *quidiam* (Leo, *Nachr. Götting. Gesellschaft*, 1895, p. 424), is chiefly used in commands, e.g. vv. 218, 354, *Trin.* 3 *i intro nunciam*, Poen. 814 *Domos abeamus nostras*,

[redacted]

Nam uel prodesse amico possum uel inimicum perdere,
Ita hic me amoenitate amoena amoenus onerauit dies.
Sine sacris hereditatem sum aptus effertissimam.

773. Nam uel (uel *in ras.*) *B* 774. moenitate *B* (*ante corr.*) V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E* amoena (*ras. ex* -nas) *V* onerauit B^3 *in ras.*: honerauit *J* dies *Pylades*: mihi *libri* 775. haereditatem *B* adeptus V^2J

sultis, nunciam, and occasionally with a Future, e.g. *Mil.* 1376 *ibo hinc intro nunciam*, Amph. 1052 *pergam in aedes nunciam.* It can only find a footing in this line on the plea that *supplicare certum est mihi* is an equivalent of *supplicabo*, as in *Cas.* 711:

A. Operam dabo. *B.* Face ut impetres.
A. Eo nunciam, nisi quippiam
Remorare me. *B.* Abi et cura,

eo is the equivalent of *ibo*. A more attractive mode of correction, if the line requires correction, would be the insertion of some word like *umquam* (cf. v. 76 *numquam quisquam*, *Truc.* 231 *nec ŭmquam quisquam*) or *quicquam* which we may suppose to have been lost in the MSS. through Homœoteleuton, just as in the Ambrosian Palimpsest *quemquam quam* has become *quemquam* in *Most.* 608 (cf. note on v. 700). The phrase *non cuiquam* (&c.) *supplico* was a current expression of independence, e.g. *Rud.* 1335 *id quod domi est, numquam ulli supplicabo*, Bacch. 225 *Domist: non metuo nec quoiquam supplico.* Cf. *Mil.* 193 *Nam mulier holitori numquam supplicat, siquast mala: Domi habet hortum et condimenta ad omnis mores maleficos*, *Pseud.* 507 *Numquam edepol quoiquam supplicabo, dum quidem Tu uiues: tu mihi hercle argentum dabis.* **Certum est mihi.** With the Inf. *certum est* is usually unaccompanied by *mihi*. But cf. *Pseud.* 90, *Cas.* 92, *Pseud.* 1239. (*Poen.* 1420 and *Asin.* 613 are doubtful.)

773. Brix proposes *prodesse possum amico*, since an alliterative pair of words in Plautus normally stand together. To me the arrangement in the MSS. seems more artistic.

774. **Amoenus dies.** *Pers.* 768 *hoc age, accumbe. hunc diem suauem Meum natalem agitemus amoenum.* Ergasilus expressed a very different opinion of the day in the first Scene of Act III. (vv. 464 sqq.). **Amoenitate amoena amoenus.** Such collections of words are quite in Plautus' manner. Cf. v. 825, *Pseud.* 940 *memorem immemorem facit qui monet quod memor meminit*, Amph. 278 *Optumo optume optumam operam das*, Cas. 826 *mala malae male monstrat.* **Onerauit.** Cf. vv. 827, 465.

775. **Sine sacris hereditatem,** 'a rose without a thorn.' *Trin.* 484 *Cena hac annonast sine sacris hereditas.* Festus (p. 410. 1 Th.) gives the following explanation of the proverb: *quod olim sacra non solum publica*

Nunc ad senem cursum capessam hunc Hegionem, cui boni
Tantum affero quantum ipsus a dis optat, atque etiam amplius.
Nunc certa res est, eodem pacto ut comici serui solent,

---

776. hegionem *ex* legionem *V*: legionem *E*: egionem *J* 777. offero *VE* (*J n. l.*) ipsus *Bothius*: ipse *libri* diis V^2J: diuis *Bothius* 778. Nunc *ex* Nun *E*

---

curiosissime administrabant, sed etiam priuata. relictusque heres sicut pecuniae, etiam sacrorum erat; ut ea diligentissime administrare esset necessarium. Cicero, commenting on the Law of the XII Tables: *sacra privata perpetua manento,* says (*Leg.* ii. 19): *Hoc uno posito, haec iura Pontificum auctoritate consecuta sunt ut, ne morte patris familias sacrorum memoria occideret, iis essent ea adiuncta ad quos eiusdem morte pecunia uenerit.* In the parallel Scene of the *Stichus* (see note on v. 843 below) the parasite exclaims (v. 384) *mi optigit hereditas.* **Sum aptus.** *Apiscor* was at a later time ousted by the Compound *adipiscor* (see note on v. 483). **Effertissimam.** The Superlative of this Participle recurs in *Asin.* 282 (quoted in the note on v. 769). We have the Comparative of another Participle in v. 782.

777. **Affero.** So in *B*, the best MS., but *offero* (cf. v. 355) in the others. Here *affero,* 'I bring news,' is the more suitable compound. **Atque etiam amplius.** If this is not a mere trick of expression, it may refer to the return of Stalagmus. To the audience it would suggest the ἀναγνώρισις of Tyndarus.

778. **Certa res est,** for *certum est,* is common in colloquial Latin. **Eodem pacto ut** (also *Merc.* 263), on the analogy of *itidem ut.* The Pronoun *idem* is normally followed by *qui,* occasionally by *atque,* but apparently never by *ut* (see *Bacch.* 949, *Merc.* 3). **Ut comici serui solent.** The *seruus currens* was one of the stock characters of the New Comedy. Cf. Ter. *Haut.* prol. 37:

> Ne semper seruos currens, iratus senex,
> Edax parasitus, sycophanta autem impudens,
> Auarus leno adsidue agendi sint mihi
> Clamore summo, cum labore maxumo.

He was represented with his *pallium* (ἱμάτιον) thrown bunchwise (*conlecto,* v. 789) over his shoulder. Cf. *Epid.* 194 *Age nunciam orna te, Epidice, et palliolum in collum conice,* Ter. *Phorm.* 844 *Sed ego nunc mihi cesso, qui non umerum hunc onero pallio Atque hominem propero inuenire, ut haec, quae contigerint, sciat,* Plaut. frag. inc. 81 *appende in umeris pallium Et*

[redacted]

Coniciam in collum pallium, primo ex med hanc rem ut audiat;
Speroque me ob hunc nuntium aeternum adepturum cibum.

779. Conitiam *VE* (*J n. l.*) collum *ex* collo *J* med *Bothius*: me *libri*
780. ob hoc V^2J nuncium *BJ*: numtium *E* cybum *V*

perge tu quantum ualet Tuorum pedum pernicitas. For free men such haste in the public streets was unseemly. Cf. *Poen.* 522:

> Liberos homines per urbem modico magis par est gradu
> Ire: seruile esse dico festinantem currere.

The god Mercury himself condescends to play the part of a *servus currens* in the *Amphitruo* (v. 986):

> Nam mihi quidem hercle qui minus liceat deo minitarier
> Populo, ni decedat mihi, quam seruolo in comoediis?
> Ille nauem saluam nuntiat aut irati aduentum senis:
> Ego sum Ioui dicto audiens, eius iussu nunc huc me adfero.

Other examples in Plautus are the parasite in the *Curculio* (II. iii.), the slave in the *Mercator* (I. ii.), the page in the *Stichus* (II. i.).

780. **Aeternum...cibum.** Cf. v. 897. The Adj. probably means 'for one's lifetime' rather than 'for ever.' It recurs *Most.* 195 *stulta es plane, Quae illum tibi aeternum putes fore amicum et beneuolentem* (cf. ib. 225 *illum amatorem tibi proprium futurum in uita*). There is no reason for believing it ever to be pronounced as a quadrisyllable (*aeviternus*) in Plautus. **Adepturum.** See note on v. 483. Ergasilus' hope is ultimately fulfilled (v. 897).

Act IV. Scene ii. Hegio, unobserved by Ergasilus, who is engaged in tucking up his 'pallium' in preparation for running, comes out of the house in a state of great dejection. His song, in monotonous Bacchiac Tetrameters, relieved only by an Iambic Dimeter Catalectic at v. 784, is in marked contrast to the gay Canticum of Act III. Sc. ii. The sight of Ergasilus in the part of a 'currens servus' rouses him from his despondency, and in the course of a lively, not to say boisterous, dialogue with the excited Parasite he learns the welcome news of his son's return. He hurriedly gives Ergasilus 'carte blanche' in his kitchen and hastens off to the harbour. The prevailing metre, after the opening Bacchiac Canticum, is the Trochaic Septenarius, but the recognition by Ergasilus of Hegio, the incident which changes the whole situation, is marked by a variation of Iambic (vv. 833, 834, 837) with Cretic lines (vv. 835, 836). With this delineation of the 'currens servus' may be compared the similar scenes mentioned above, *Curc.* II. iii., *Merc.* I. ii., *Stich.* II. i.

HEGIO senex, ERGASILVS parasitus. IV. ii.

Quanto in pectore hanc rem meo magis uoluto,
Tanto mi aegritudo auctior est in animo.
Ad illum modum sublitum os esse mi hodie!
Neque id perspicere quiui.
Quod quom scibitur, <tum> per urbem inridebor.
Cum extemplo ad forum aduenero, omnes loquentur:
'Hic ille est senex doctus, quoi uerba data sunt.'

IV. ii. SENEX PARASITVS B^3: HEGIO SENEX ERGASILVS PARASITVS *ceteri* (EGIO *J*: PARSITVS *E*) 781. SEN. Uanto *c. sp. in* V^1 (q *in marg.* V^2): S. uanto *E* hac *J* in pectore *post* magis *iterat E* uolupto *J* 782. mihi *libri* (michi *J*) egritudo *libri* auctiorem (-rē) V^1 (*ex* act-) (*corr.* V^2) *E* 783. sublitum ϛ: subitum *libri* (sub B^3 *e corr.*) mi hodie *Bothius*: hodie mihi *libri* (hodie *om. J*) 784. *Priori adiungunt libri* 785. com BV^1: cum V^2EJ <tum> *Lindemannus* irridebor *EJ* 787. doctus *Dousa Centur.* I 19 *cum aliis* (*ut ms. Lang.*): ductus *libri* quoi B^3: quo B^1V^1E: cui V^2J dota J^1 (*corr.* J^2)

---

781. **Quanto...(tanto)** (*Amph.* 548, *Cas.* 805, *Rud.* 1301) is not so common as *quam...(tam)* with Comparatives in Plautus, e.g. *Bacch.* 1091 *quam magis id reputo, tam magis uror*, Bacch. 1076 *Quam magis in pectore meo foueo, quas meus filius turbas turbet...Magis curaest magisque adformido.*

782. **Auctior.** On the form see note on v. 775, and on the scansion, Introd. ii. § 1.

783. **Sublitum os esse.** The Inf. here is probably an Inf. of Exclamation and not dependent on *aegritudo.* See the passages quoted in the note on v. 656. We have however the Inf. after *aegre est mihi* in vv. 129, 701.

784. This line would be assimilated to the Metre of the others by the change of *perspicere* to *spicere.* The appearance of an Iambic line however in a Bacchiac passage is not uncommon, e.g. *Cas.* 836, 838, *Men.* 774, *Most.* 90, Ter. *Andr.* 485. Besides *perspicere* is more suitable in this context.

785. The first line of a Bacchiac passage is not unfrequently syncopated or catalectic, so that the traditional reading may be right:

Quod quóm scibitúr, per úrbem inridébor.

However the 'echo' of *cum* with *tum* (which might easily drop out after *-tur* of *scibitur*) is quite in Plautus' manner, e.g. *Bacch.* 145 *cum uidebis, tum scies.*

786. **Cum extemplo,** a common adverbial phrase in Plautus, e.g. v. 434, *Trin.* 242, 492, 725.

787. *Pers.* 595 *Vide sis: ego ille doctus leno paene in foueam decidi.*

Sed Ergasilus estne hic procul quem uideo?
Conlecto quidem est pallio. quidnam acturust?
ERG. Moue aps te moram atque, Ergasile, age hanc rem.
Eminor interminorque ne[quis] mi obstiterit obuiam,

---

788. <ire> uideo *Bosscha* *fort.* uideo? <ipsust.> 789. Collecto *J* quidest *V*[1]: quidem est *ceteri cum V*[2] quidem nam *V* acturus est *VJ* 790. ERG. *libri* (*J n. l.*) (*usque ad v.* 810 P *Ergasilum* S *Hegionem notant BVE, dein* E *et* H *iterumque illis*: PAR(asitus) *et* EG(io) *J*; *cf. ad vv.* 838, 839) Mone *J* abs *VEJ* moram <moram> *Schoellius* 791. quis *del. Guietus* mihi *libri* (michi *J*)

Hic ille est. Cf. note on v. 518. **Quoi.** This Dative-form, a form still in use in Quintilian's youth (*Inst.* i. 7. 27), has usually suffered at the hands of copyists. When they recognize that a Dative is required, they change it to *cui*, otherwise to *quo* and sometimes *qui*.

788. **Sed Ergasilus estne hic?** This arrangement is abnormal. Usually *sed estne* stand together, e.g. *Most.* 310 *Sed estne hic meus sodalis?*, Ter. *Eun.* 848 *Sed estne haec Thais, quam uideo? ipsast*, 974 *Sed estne ille noster Parmeno? et certe ipsus est*, or else *sed hicine* (*isne*), e.g. Ter. *Andr.* 907 *sed hicinest Simo?*, Merc. 598 *Sed isne est quem currentem uideo? ipsus est.* Kaempf suggests *Sed Ergasilusnest*, rightly objecting to the form *Ergasilustne* (which would make the line an Anapaestic Dimeter), as hardly Plautine. The line would become an Acatalectic Bacchiac Tetrameter by the addition *uideo?* <*ipsust.*> or <*ire*> *uideo* or <*ego*> *uideo*.

789. **Conlecto.** Mart. VII. xxxiii. 4 *collige togam.* (See note on v. 779.)

790. The MSS. offer a 'contracted' bacchiac line, which is not out of keeping with the conclusion of a bacchiac passage (see note on v. 785). At the same time Schoell's addition of *mōram*, 'foolish,' which makes an acatalectic Tetrameter, is very likely to be right. If Plautus wrote *mŏram mōram* the probability of one of the two similar neighbouring words being lost would be very great indeed. **Age hanc rem,** a variety of the usual *hoc age*.

791. **Eminor** is ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. But we have *eminatio* in v. 799. **Nequis.** The reading of the MSS. would be metrical, either with the scansion *nĕquis* (Introd. ii. § 13) or *interminorqu*(*e*) (Introd. ii. § 14). But Leo and Brix are probably right in deleting *quis*, on the strength of lines like *Asin.* 154 *Non potest auferre hinc a me si quis emptor uenerit*, Rud. 476, *Aul.* 207, *Pers.* 373, *Most.* 614, *Truc.* 469. **Obstiterit obuiam,** a phrase appropriate to a *seruus currens.* Cf. *Stich.* 287 *Si rex obstabit obuiam*,

Nisi quis satis diu uixisse sese homo arbitrabitur.
Nam qui obstiterit, ore sistet. HEG. Hic homo pugilatum incipit.
ERG. Facere certumst. proinde ut omnes itinera insistant sua:
Ne quis in hanc plateam negoti conferat quicquam sui.
Nam meumst ballista pugnum, cubitus catapultast mihi,

---

792. qui *Gruterus* (qui homo '*quidam libri*' *Lambini*) sere *ut vid.* V^1 (*corr.* V^2) arbitratur *B* : arbitrabitrabitur *V*: arbitrabitur *ex* ab- *E* 793. pugillatum *libri* 794. ERG. B^3: *om. ceteri* (*cf. ad v.* 795) certuntst *B* : certum est *VJ* ut] ut*ut *J ut vid.* : ita *Fleckeisenus* 795. ERG. *praem.* B^1VEJ (*cf. ad v.* 794) 795. in hanc plateam *Bothius*[3]: in hac platea *libri* (platea *ex* pa- *V*) negotii *libri* (-cii *J*) 796. *versum laudant Nonius p.* 552, 13 (*s. v.* catapulta) 'nam meus...mihi,' *Grammaticus de dubiis nominibus p.* 587, 12 *K.* (*s. v.* pugnum *genere neutro*) 'mihi haec balista pugnum est' meus est *libri cum Nonio*: mihi haec *Gramm. d. d. n.* : mihi hoc *Schoellius* palissta *ut vid.* B^1: palista B^3: balista *J cum Nonii codd. deterr. et gramm. d. d. n.* pugnus *libri cum Nonio*: pugnum est *gramm. d. d. n.* catapulta est *V cum codd. Nonii* : catapultast (c *ex* a) *E* : catapula est *J* mihi *om. ut vid. J*

---

regem ipsum prius peruortito, Amph. 985 *Nec quisquam nunc tam audax fuat homo, qui obuiam obsistat mihi.*

793. **Ore sistet**, Intrans. So *capite sistere* in *Curc.* 286 *Quin cadat, quin capite sistat in uia de semita*, Mil. 850 *capite sistebant cadi.*

794. **Ut** is changed by editors to *ita.* But we have a parallel in *Amph.* 214 *proinde uti Propere suis de finibus exercitus deducerent.* The jussive use of the Conjunction (the correlative of prohibitive *ne*) is by no means rare (cf. v. 114 above). **Itinera insistant.** *Cist.* 679 *Utrum hac an illac iter institerit*, Mil. 793 *erro quam insistas uiam*, Epid. 416 *rectam institit.*

795. Whether Bothe's change of *in hac platea* of the MSS. is absolutely necessary may be doubted, in view of Early Latin constructions like *in potestatem esse*, *in mentem esse*, &c. (see Aul. Gellius I. vii. 16), with their confusion of the Acc. and Abl. after *in.*

796. **Ballista** and **catapulta** are later only applied to the machines for throwing stones and darts, but in Republican Latin designate the missiles themselves. Cf. *Trin.* 668 *Itast amor, ballista ut iacitur: nil sic celerest neque uolat*, Pers. 28 *Vide modo, ulmeae catapultae tuom ne transfigant latus*, Titin. *Com.* 125 R. *quasi quom catapulta auolat*, Lucil. xxviii. 42

[redacted]

Vmerus aries, tum genu ad quemque iecero ad terram dabo,
Dentilegos omnis mortales faciam, quemque offendero.
HEG. Quae illaec eminatiost nam ? nequeo mirari satis.

797. Humerus V^2J quemque *ex* quemquem *ut vid. E* iecero (ce *in ras. ut vid.* B^3) *B* 798. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 178 'omnes mortales dentilegos faciam' Dentilegos ϛ: Dentilecos *libri* omnis *J*: omnes *cett.* fatiam *E* 799. Que B^1 (*corr.* B^3) illec *libri* eminatio est *VJ*: ominatio est *ut vid. E* queo *J*

Quid sic ballistas iactas centenarias? The word *ballista* is used only of the missile by Plautus, the machine from which the *ballista* was discharged being called *ballistarium* (*-us* ?). Cf. *Poen.* 201 *Quoi iam infortuni intenta ballistast probe, Quam ego haud multo post mittam e ballistario.* The word *catapulta* is however applied to the machine from which the missile (*pilum catapultarium*) is thrown in *Curc.* 690 *quia ego ex te hodie faciam pilum catapultarium Atque ita te neruo torquebo, itidem ut catapultae solent.* In Cicero *ballista* appears in its later sense in *Tusc.* ii. 24. 57: *ballistae lapidum et reliqua tormenta telorum eo graviores emissiones habent, quo sunt contenta atque adducta vehementius.* Ergasilus compares his fist to the stone (*ballista*), his lower arm to the dart (*catapulta* or *telum catapultarium*). **Pugnum.** In a grammatical treatise (*de dub. nominibus*, in Keil's *Gramm. Lat.* v. p. 587, 12) drawn from ancient sources a Neuter form *pugnum* is declared to have been used in this line: '*Pugnum' Plautus genere neutro dixit.* '*mihi haec* (leg. *hoc*) *balista pugnum est,' sed melius masculinum est.* In the absence of confirmation of this form most editors prefer to adhere to the traditional text. But the spelling *meust* for *meumst*, if mistaken for *meus est*, might easily have changed the form in our MSS., and it seems to me difficult to set altogether aside the express testimony to this form in this line. The Grammarian's *mihi hoc...est* may however have been what Plautus wrote, and may have been changed in a later recension to *meus est...pugnus.*

797. **Ad quemque iecero.** If this, the traditional reading, is to be retained we must scan *quemqu(e)* (Introd. ii. § 14). Leo and Brix adopt the correction *quemque icero*, omitting *ad*, which they ascribe to a scribe's anticipation of *ad terram.* Fleckeisen changes *ad* to *ut.* **Quemque** has its O. Lat. sense of *quemcunque*, as in v. 798 and often in Plautus. The Enclitic Particle *que*, 'ever' (Gk. τε, in Hom. ὅς τε, 'whoever'), was in class. Lat. replaced by *cumque* (*cunque*), lit. 'whensoever' (Hor. *C.* i. 32. 15 *mihi cumque salve Rite vocanti*). So *quandoque* became *quandocunque.*

799. **Nam**, for the position of this Early Latin Interrogative Particle (e.g. *quianam*, 'why,' from *quia*, 'because') cf. *Most.* 258 *quid cerussa opust nam?*

ERG. Faciam ut huius diei locique meique semper meminerit.

Qui mihi in cursu [opstiterit], faxo uitae is extemplo opstiterit suae.

HEG. Quid hic homo tantum incipissit facere cum tantis minis?

ERG. Prius edico, ne quis propter culpam capiatur suam:

Continete uos domi, prohibete a uobis uim meam.

---

800. Fatiam *E* eius *B* die *Bothius* 801. obstiterit *VE* (*cum 2 litt. spat.*) *J*: *seclusi* uite *B* extemplo *om. J* obstiterit *libri* 804. domi *ex* domu *B*

---

800. This line is stolen by Terence *Eun.* 801:

> non tu hinc abis?
> Scin tu ut tibi res se habeat? si quicquam hodie hic turbae coeperis,
> Faciam ut huius loci dieique meique semper memineris.

Diei, a disyllable. Whether it is better written *diei* (in later orthography *dii*) or *die* is uncertain. (See note on v. 464.)

801. To reduce the line to metrical limits some word must be deleted, most probably one of the two similar verbs. I delete the first, rather than the second, since it is the first occurrence of a word which is generally suppressed in the construction ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, e.g. Lucr. iv. 1010 (*pugnas*) *Edere sunt persectantes uisaeque uolantes*, Amph. 785 *Tu peperisti Amphitruonem, ego alium peperi Sosiam*, Lucr. iv. 774 *Tantast mobilitas et rerum copia tanta*, Pseud. 440 *tu quod damni et quod fecisti flagiti.* Cf. note on v. 690. Another possibility is to delete the second and put a comma after *cursu*:

> Qui mi in cursu, opstiterit faxo uitae is extemplo suae.

This position of *faxo* is abnormal, but may be paralleled from *Most.* 1133 *ego ferare faxo ut meruisti in crucem*, Ter. *Adel.* 209 *cupide accipiat faxo*, 847 *Atque ibi fauillae plena, fumi ac pollinis Coquendo sit faxo et molendo.*

802. **Incipissit.** This Early Latin form is found no fewer than three times in this single play (cf. vv. 215, 532).

803. **Ne** is not dependent on *edico*. The *edictum* is stated in v. 804.

804. **Continete uos domi.** *Curc.* 298 *Proin se<se> domi contineant, uitent infortunio.* **Prohibete a uobis uim meam.** This is the usual construction of the verb in Plautus, *prohibere aliquem* (*aliquid*) *ab aliquo*,

HEG. Mira edepol sunt, ni hic in uentrem sumpsit confidentiam.
Vae misero illi, cuius cibo iste factust imperiosior.
ERG. Tum pistores scrofipasci, qui alunt furfuribus sues,
Quarum odore praeterire nemo pistrinum potest,

---

806. Ve *libri* cybo *V* factus est *VJ* imperiosior B^3: impensior *cett.*, *sed* impensiar V^1 (*corr.* V^2) *E ante corr.* 807. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 561 'scrophipasci...furfure sues' scrophipasci *libri* furfuribus *Luchsius in Studem. Stud.* 1 *p.* 56: furfure *libri* 808. preterire *BV* pistrinium *E*

---

or else *aliquo* (*aliqua re*) without *ab*, e.g. v. 493, *Mil.* 699 *Me uxore prohibent.* But the Dative replaces this Abl. in *Curc.* 605 (if not elsewhere): *parentes ne meos mihi prohibeas.*

805. **Mira...sunt ni**, a common variation of *mirum est ni.* The hiatus with *ni* is legitimate, so that we need not change the traditional reading to *nisi hic* (as in *Poen.* 839 *Omnia edepol mira sunt, nisi erus hunc heredem facit*). (Introd. ii. § 40.) Of course the scansion *hĭc* is impossible (Introd. ii. § 5).

806. **Imperiosior.** Cf. v. 811, *Asin.* 410, *Pseud.* 996, Enn. *A.* 600 M. *urbis magnas atque imperiosas.*

807. **Pistores...qui...Eorum** (v. 809). For the construction, repeated in vv. 813—6, 818—21, see note on v. 1, and cf. v. 110. **Pistores,** 'millers.' There were no bakers (as distinguished from millers) at Rome till 173 B.C. (Plin. *N. H.* XVIII. xi. 28) (cf. ad v. 160). **Scrofipasci,** ἅπ. εἰρ. **Furfuribus.** The MSS. have *furfure.* Since the Abl. Sg. in *-ĕ* had often a by-form in *-ī*, editors formerly printed *furfuri.* This reading however violates the law that an iambic word at the end of a line shall not be preceded by an iambic word-ending (Introd. iii. § 17). This might be remedied by transposing *furfure qui alunt sues.* But an examination of the passages in Latin writers where the word occurs proves that *furfur* Sing. was used in the sense of the husk of a single grain (Gell. XI. vii. 5, Plin. *N. H.* xviii. 304, xxii. 145), whereas the word for 'chaff, bran' (the word required here) is *furfures* Plur. (Varr. *R. R.* II. v. 17, vi. 4, Colum. VIII. iv. 1, XII. xliii. 3, Plin. *N. H.* xviii. 74, xxii. 120, xxviii. 188, Phaedr. IV. xviii. 3; cf. Marc. Empir. v. fin.). We may then confidently suppose that *furfuribus* was what Plautus wrote, especially since *furfures* occurs in v. 810. Probably in the ancient archetype of our MSS. the word was written FVRFVRIB. with the common contraction of final *-bus*, and became at some time or other corrupted to *furfure* (through *furfuri*?).

808. **Odore,** Abl. of Cause, common in the Comedians (e.g. *Pseud.* 799 A. *Cur conducebas?* B. *Inopia*), and not quite unknown in Cic., e.g. *Phil.* xiv. 5 *ne...uim fortunae stultitia contempsisse uideamur.*

Eorum si quoiusquam scrofam in publico conspexero,
Ex ipsis dominis meis pugnis exculcabo furfures.
HEG. Basilicas edictiones atque inperiosas habet:
Satur homost, habet profecto in uentre confidentiam.
ERG. Tum piscatores, qui praebent populo pisces foetidos,
Qui aduehuntur quadrupedanti crucianti cantherio,
Quorum odos subbasilicanos omnis abegit in forum,

---

809. quoiusquam *B*(?)*V*: quouisquam *B*(?)*EJ* scropham *libri* 811. editiones *libri* (*corr.* ς) inperiosas *J*: imp- *ceteri* 812. homo est *VJ*: homust *E* 813. prebent *libri* fetidos *B*: fetidos *ex* fecidos *V*: fecidos *ex* fetidos *E* 814. quadrupedancia B^1 crutianti *E* 815. *versum laudat Priscianus inst.* I *p.* 31, 18 *H.* (*s. v.* odos) 'quorum...forum' subbalsicanos *VE* omnis *J*: omnes *cett.* adegit *Priscianus*

---

809. **Quoiusquam.** The old spelling *quoius* may owe its preservation in this line to a confusion with *quouis* (as in v. 887 *quoius erat* has been preserved as *quo iusserat*). Some editors, under the mistaken idea that these Pronominal Genitives never have the ictus on the syllable *-us* (e.g. prol. 4, 17), insert *ego* (cf. vv. 816, 821) after *si* or before *si*.

810. **Pugnis exculcabo,** an inappropriate combination chosen for comic effect.

811. Schoell puts this line after v. 817, so that *Tum* of v. 818 marks a new resumption by Ergasilus, as in v. 813. This makes Ergasilus' utterances a still closer parody of a magisterial *edictum* in which the separate paragraphs would be headed by Conjunctions of this kind.

814. **Quadrupedanti,** 'trotting,' Accius *Trag.* 603 R. *quadripedantum sonipedum*, Enn. *Trag.* 154 R. **Crucianti cantherio.** Ausonius *Epist.* XXI. ii. 39 *trinodem dactylum Vidi parari crucianti cantherio.* It seems more in keeping with Plautus' use of *crucio* to take *crucianti* as Act., i.e. 'torturing its rider,' 'jolting,' than as Deponent-Passive (as in Fronto *Epp.* p. 220. 6 Nab. *in crucem sublatus est. ita ei crucianti somnium expeditum*, p. 184. 16 Nab. *membris cruciantibus*) (cf. however *Truc.* 450).

815. **Subbasilicanos,** 'strollers in the colonnades of the basilica,' like *surrostrani* Cic. *Fam.* VIII. i. 4. Cf. *Curc.* 472 *Ditis damnosos maritos sub basilica quaerito.* Livy (xxvi. 27) tells us that in 210 B.C. there was no basilica at Rome, and (xxxix. 44) that Cato the Censor in 184 B.C. (the year of Plautus' death) built the Porcia Basilica, statements from which the false inference has been drawn that there was no basilica at Rome prior to 184 B.C., and that this line must therefore be post-Plautine. **Abegit** (with *ĕ*) is the old spelling of *abigit*, as *accĕdo* (Enn. *Trag.* 77. 206 R., Lucr. ii. 1025, v. 609 &c.) of *accido*, *timedus* (Naev. *Com.* 35 R.) of *timidus*, *acetare*

[redacted]

Eis ego ora uerberabo surpiculis piscariis,
Ut sciant, alieno naso quam exhibeant molestiam.
Tum lanii autem, qui concinnant liberis orbas oues,
Qui locant caedundos agnos et dupla agninam danunt,
Qui petroni nomen indunt uerueci sectario,
Eum ego si in uia petronem publica conspexero,

---

816. ergo *VEJ* hora *J* (*corr. rec. ut vid.*) uerberabo *ex* -bor *E* 817. exhibeant (ex B^3 *in ras.*) *B*: exibeant *J* 818. lanu B^1 (*corr.* B^3): lanum *VEJ* orabas *J* 819. cedundos *libri* angnos *ex* angnonos *ut vid.* (gn *eras.*) *B* dupla *Rostius Opusc.* I *p.* 41: duplam *libri* 820. uerueti *libri* 821. publico *J*

(Paul. Fest. 17. 30 Th.) of *agitare.* **In forum.** The rarity of this phrase in Plautus (cf. *Rud.* 987) need not make us change it to the usual *ad forum* (e.g. v. 786). *In* is the suitable Preposition in this context.

818. **Concinnant.** See note on v. 601. **Orbas.** This Adj. takes the Genitive in its other occurrence in Plautus, *Rud.* 349 *orbas auxilique opumque*, but the Abl. in Ter. *Adel.* 650 *haec uirgo orbast patre*, Afran. *Com.* 240 R. *Orbus uirili sexu adoptauit sibi*, and apparently in Enn. *Trag.* 77 R. *Arce et urbe orba sum.*

819. **Qui locant caedundos agnos.** Cf. *Aul.* 567 A. *Etiam agnum misi...Caedundum illum ego conduxi.* B. *Tum tu idem optumumst Loces efferendum: nam iam, credo, mortuust.* **Dupla,** sc. *pecunia.* Leo retains *duplam* of the MSS. One would expect the trick to consist in the substitution of an old sheep for the lamb assigned to them to kill, but it is difficult to see how *duplam* could bear any suitable sense; nor may we translate the following line with Morris 'who pass off a tough old wether (*petroni*) as a tender fat sheep.' **Danunt.** These Early Latin forms with 'inserted' *n* are all Third Plural forms, e.g. *nequīnont* Liv. Andr. (See my *Latin Language* ch. viii. § 74.)

820. **Sectario.** The word is explained in Paulus' epitome of Festus (500. 12 Th.) as follows: *Sectarius vervex, qui gregem agnorum praecedens ducit*, our 'bell-wether.' This explanation is so strongly supported by the obvious connexion of the word with *sector*, 'I follow' (e.g. *Mil.* 91 *Ait sese ultro omnis mulieres sectarier*), and *secta*, 'a following' (e.g. Naev. *Bell. Poen.* 9 M. *Eorum sectam sequontur multi mortales*), that no other theory can be approved (e.g. the derivation from *seco*).

821. **Eum,** Gen. Pl., the old form of *eorum*, as *deum*, &c. (Paul. Fest. 54. 20 Th. '*Eum*' *antiqui dicebant pro eorum*), is found on the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C. (*C. I. L.* i. 206. 52): *eum h*(*ac*) *l*(*ege*) *n*(*ihil*) *r*(*ogatur*). But here the word is more likely to be Acc. Sing. Brix substitutes *Eorum*

Et petronem et dominum reddam mortales miserrumos.
HEG. Eugepae! edictiones aedilicias hic quidem habet,
Mirumque adeost ni hunc fecere sibi Aetoli agoranomum.
ERG. Non ego nunc parasitus sum, sed regum rex regalior,

---

822. miserrimos *V*: miserrumos *ex* -imos *ut vid.* *E*: miserumos *J* 823. Eugepe *libri* (Euge *J*) pe...habet *addidit in lacuna* *B*[3] editiones *VEJ* edilicias *B*: et dilitias *V*: editias *ante corr.*, ediuitias *ut vid. post corr.* *E*: et delicias *J* 824. adeo est *VJ* *post* adeost 2 *litt. sp.* *E* nisi *E* *verba* ni...agoranomum *addidit in lacuna* *B*[3] fecerunt *VEJ* etoli *B*: aetholi *J* Aetoli sibi *Guietus* 825. sum *ex* se- *V*

---

without any support from the MSS. **Petronem.** The word *petro*, 'man of rock,' from *petra* (either the Gk word or more probably an Italian cognate; cf. Fest. 250. 12 Th.) was a term for a countryman, as we see from Paulus' epitome of Festus (251. 1 Th.): *'Petrones' rustici a petrarum asperitate et duritia dicti.* The corresponding passage in Festus is unfortunately defective in the MS. (250. 23 Th.): *'Petrones' rustici fere dicuntur propter vetustatem, et quod deterrima quaeque ac praeruptus...iam agri petrae vocantur, ut 'rupices' idem a 'rupi*bus.' The *lanii* apparently used the word as a pet-name for the bell-wether of the flock. In view of the explanation given by Festus the theory that the word is a proper name (cf. *Petronius*) in this line and v. 822 must be rejected. Nor does it seem likely that there is any assonance in v. 822 with *patronum*. Whether the *petrŏnius canis* of Grattius *Cyneg.* 202 *Petroniost haec fama cani* has anything to do with *petro*, *-ōnis* of Plautus is not clear.

823. **Hic quidem** must be scanned *hĭ(c) quidem* (Introd. ii. § 13), since a Dactyl cannot stand in the 7th foot of a Trochaic Septenarius (Introd. iii. § 17).

824. **Mirumque adeost ni.** The Substantive Verb is usually omitted with *mirum ni*, *mirum quin*, but supplied with *mira sunt ni* (*nisi*). (The reading of *Vid.* 77 is uncertain *mirum est ni* or *si*.) This suggests the possibility of *-st* having originated from *si*, a marginal correction of *ni* to *nisi*. **Sibi,** in Prosodic Hiatus. But *Aetoli sibi* may be the true order. **Agoranomum** (*Curc.* 285, *Mil.* 727), beside *aedilicias* of v. 823, offers a curious medley of Greek and Roman terms. The peremptory orders of the slave in the *Stichus* (see the passage quoted in the note on v. 843) occasion the same ironical surmise (v. 352): *sine suffragio Populi tamen aedilitatem hic quidem gerit.*

825. **Regum rex regalior,** a jingle quite in the manner of the Republican Drama. Cf. Enn. *Trag.* 41 R. *Mater optumarum multo mulier*

[redacted]

Tantus uentri conmeatus meo adest in portu cibus.
Sed ego cesso hunc Hegionem onerare laetitia senem,
Qui homine <homo> adaeque nemo uiuit fortunatior.

---

826. *versum laudat Prisc. inst.* VI *p.* 158, 23 *H.* (*s. v.* cibus *cas. genetiv.*) 'tantus ...cibus' comneatus *E*: comeatus *Prisc. codd. DHLK*: commeatus *cett.* porti *J* 827. egionem *EJ* honerare *J* leticia *B*: laeticia *VJ*: letitia *E* 828. hominem *VE ut vid. J* adeque *BE*: adequae *V*: adaequae *J* nemo (ne *ex* m) *V* furtunatior *J*

---

melior mulierum, a line which exhibits the same use of the Comparative for the Superlative. On the meaning of *rex* see the note on v. 92.

826. **Conmeatus.** Cf. *Mil.* 224 *Qua cibatus commeatusque ad te et legiones tuas Tuto possit peruenire.* **Cibus.** Priscian takes this for a Fourth Decl. Gen. Sing., instead of Nom. Sing. with *uentri commeatus meo* in apposition. The same doubt attaches to *lectus* in *Amph.* 513:

Prius abis quam lectus ubi cubuisti concaluit locus,

where Priscian makes the word a Fourth Decl. Gen. Sing. governed by *locus*, though it may equally be Nom. Sing. with *ubi cubuisti locus* in apposition. In view of the narrow limits of the Fourth Declension in Plautus (see note on v. 855), I hesitate to accept Priscian's explanation. For the inverted order of the sentence cf. *Mil.* 1043 *deus dignior fuit quisquam homo qui esset?* Brix suggests punctuation after *adest*, the Verb to be understood as repeated after *cibus*.

827. **Hunc Hegionem...senem.** For the order cf. ad v. 875, and for the sense of *hunc*, ad v. 7. In *Aul.* 171 we have:

Nostin hunc senem Euclionem ex proxumo pauperculum?

There is no need to make this and similar phrases with *cesso* Interrogative Sentences.

828. The defect in the line is likely to have been caused by the loss (through Haplography) of the word *homo* in some form. Leo accepts Camerarius' insertion of *hominum* after *homine*. But the Plautine phrase is *nemo homo*, not *nemo hominum* (Ter. *Eun.* 757). (On the Hiatus after *homo* see Introd. ii. § 40.) The form *qui* presents a difficulty, for this Abl. (or Instrumental) is normally used as a Pronoun rather than a Pronominal Adjective, and in no other line does it play the part of an Abl. after a Comparative. For all that, to change the 'lectio difficilior' of the MSS. *qui homine* into *quo homine* is of doubtful expediency. The use of *qui* (Interrog. Pron.) as Abl. Abs. in *Bacch.* 335, *Sed qui praesente id aurum Theotimo datumst?*, is similarly an isolated example. Such lines as *Cas.* 863 *Senem, quo senex nequior nullus uiuit*, Merc. 101 *Mulier, qua mulier*

HEG. Quae illaec est laetitia, quam illic laetus largitur mihi?

ERG. Heus ubi estis? ecquis hic est? ecquis hoc aperit ostium?

HEG. Hic homo ad cenam recipit se ad me. ERG. Aperite hasce ambas fores,

Prius quam pultando assulatim foribus exitium adfero.

---

829. illec *B*: illa haec *VE* leticia *B*: letitia *E*: laeticia *J* letus *E* lagitur *B ante corr.* 830. ecquis hic est ecquis *Bothius*: ecquis *libri* (haec quis *V*) hoc B^3 (hic *ut vid.* B^1) *J*: haec *V*: *om. E* hostium *VEJ* 831. caenam *VJ* apperite (*ex* aperite) *cum* 2 *litt. sp. E* 832. *versum laudat Nonius p.* 72, 22 (*s. v.* assulatim) 'priusquam...dabo' pulsando *codd. Nonii* assulatim *Nonius*: uel assultatim *B*, *sed* tatim B^3 *in spat.*: uel absultatim uel assultatim *VE*: uel assultatim *J* exicium *J* affero *J*: dabo *Nonius*

---

alia nullast pulchrior, shew a different form of expression. For the use of *adaeque* cf. *Most.* 30:

> Quo nemo adaeque iuuentute ex omni Attica
> Antehac est habitus parcus nec magis continens,

and see note on v. 700. **Viuit** in colloquial Latin often corresponds to *est*, e.g. *Cas.* 863 (quoted above), *Trin.* 390 *lepidus uiuis.*

830. The missing words can be supplied with confidence from *Amph.* 1020 *Aperite hoc: heus, ecquis hic est? ecquis hoc aperit ostium?*, Bacch. 582 *Heus, ecquis hic est? ecquis hoc aperit ostium?* The eye of the copyist of some archetype had wandered from the first to the second *ecquis.* **Heus ubi estis?** *Pseud.* 1136:

> *A.* Heus ubi estis uos? *B.* Hic quidem ad me recta habet rectam uiam.
> *A.* Heus ubi estis uos?...
> Ecquis hoc aperit?

On the scansion of *ecquis hŏc*, a dactyl (tribrach?; cf. Introd. ii. § 13) at the beginning of the second hemistich, see Introd. iii. § 16, and on *heus ubi estis* cf. ad v. 950.

831. **Ad cenam recipit se ad me.** Fleckeisen transposes *recipit se ad me ad cenam* on the pattern of vv. 175, 497, *Mil.* 712, *Most.* 1134, *Stich.* 486, 510. But *ad cenam* seems to be emphasized in this line. **Hasce ambas fores,** with *fores* in the sense of *valvas.* Cf. *Most.* 453 *Pultando [pedibus] paene confregi hasce ambas <fores>.* So *foris* Sing. for *valva* in *Bacch.* 833 *Forem hanc pausillulum aperi—placide, ne crepa.*

832. **Assulatim.** *Men.* 859 *Osse fini dedolabo assulatim uiscera.* The Adverb is derived from *assula*, 'a splinter' (*Merc.* 129 *At etiam asto.*

[redacted]

HEG. Perlubet hunc hominem conloqui. Ergasile! ERG. Ergasilum qui uocat?
HEG. Respice. ERG. Fortuna quod tibi nec facit nec faciet, me iubes.
Sed quis est? HEG. Respice ad me; Hegio sum. ERG. Oh mihi,

833. Periubet *VE* colloqui *BJ*: cōloqui *E* hergasilum *B* 834. tibi] *J n. l.* facit (it *B*[3] *in ras.*) *B*: facis *V ante corr.* fatiet *E* me *Brixius*: hoc me *libri* 835. qui *B*: quid *VE* (*J n. l.*) ego sum *J* oh *ex* hoh *ras. V*

at etiam cesso foribus facere hisce assulas. Aperite aliquis), a by-form of which was *astula*. Probably *assula* was the original form (derived from *assilio*?), while *astula* was a popular corruption of it, due to fanciful connexion with *hasta*. *Astula* must have been the form prevalent in Vulgar Latin, for it is the origin of the Romance words for 'splinter' (Provençal 'ascla,' &c.). In the Archetype of our MSS. the word *assulatim* had apparently a suprascript entry *vel assultatim*. This may have been either (1) a rival reading, or (2) an explanation of *assulatim* as meaning not 'in splinters' (from *assula*) but 'leaping at it' (from *assilio*). Whatever was the purport of this suprascript entry, there is no clue to its antiquity. It may have come down from ancient times. It may equally be due to some mediaeval monk. There is further a possibility that *vel assultatim* is a corruption of *vel astulatim*. **Adfero.** The *dabo* of Nonius' quotation of this line may be the reading of another ancient edition of Plautus.

833. **Conloqui,** like *alloqui*, is often transitive in Plautus, e.g. *Trin.* 1135 *quid ego cesso hos colloqui?*

834. We have a similar pun on *respicio* in *Poen.* 408, where a lover calls after his mistress: *respice. Respexit. idem edepol Venerem credo facturam tibi.* (Cf. Afran. *Com.* 429 R. A. *Num quis me quaesiit?* B. *Bona fortuna.*) There were temples of Fortuna Respiciens on the Palatine and the Esquiline and elsewhere. **Quod tibi.** A Personal Pronoun normally follows immediately a Relative Pronoun or Adverb, e.g. vv. 93?, 1004, &c.

835. **Quis.** The metre suggests, if it does not demand, *quis* rather than *qui* of *B*. All instances in the MSS. of Plautus of *qui* for *quis* (substantival) before an initial vowel in direct question are of doubtful genuineness, *Truc.* 130 (*qui es* P, *quis est* A edd.), *Curc.* 230 (*qui hic est* B[1]VEJ, *quis hic est* B[3] edd.), *Trin.* 929, 1083 (*qui eas emit* CD, *quis* &c. B edd.), *Truc.* 719, *Epid.* 250 (*qui id dixit tibi* A, *quis* &c. P edd.), *Pseud.*

Quantum est hominum optumorum optume, in tempore aduenis.

HEG. Nescio quem ad portum nactus es ubi cenes, eo fastidis.

ERG. Cedo manum. HEG. Manum? ERG. Manum, inquam, cedo tuam actutum. HEG. Tene.

836. *versus a voc.* Hominum *incipit in libris* (quantum est *in fine v.* 835) optimorum *VJ ut vid.* 837. nactus *ex* natus *J* caenes *B* fastidis *ex* fatidis *V* 838. Credo manu ·H· (=HEG.) manu *VE* Tene *proximo versui adiunctum in libris*

1193, *Bacch.* 309, *Men.* 146. In *Amph.* 619 the MSS. have the same corruption as *VE* here, viz. *quid* (*quis* B[3]). (See note on v. 285.)

836. **Quantumst hominum optumorum optume,** a characteristic Superlative of colloquial Latin. Cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 853 *O omnium, quantum est qui uiuont, homo hominum ornatissume*, Rud. 706 *Exi e fano, natum quantumst hominum sacrilegissume*, Pseud. 351 *Quid ais, quantum terram tetigit hominum periurissume?* **In tempore** occurs only in this line and *Amph.* 877 *Atque Alcumenae in tempore auxilium feram.* It has the addition of *ipse* in *Cist.* 670 *in tempore ipso*, Poen. 1138 *Quom huc aduenisti hodie in ipso tempore.* Some editors propose to make this line a Cretic Pentameter Acatalectic by inserting *ipso*:

Quantumst hominum optumorum optume in tempore <ipso> aduenis.

But we are hardly warranted in departing from the traditional reading, especially as *in tempore* became the current expression in the time of Terence. *Temperi* (not used by Terence) is the common Plautine term, of which *tempore* (found in the MSS. in *Asin.* 733, *Epid.* 406, *Men.* 1020) may be a corruption (see note on v. 183). Plautus employs also *per tempus* in this sense (e.g. *Men.* 139 *Non potuisti magis per tempus mi aduenire quam aduenis*). Seyffert's division of the lines into two Cretic Tetrameters and a Trochaic Dimeter is more attractive (on *ád portúm* cf. Introd. iii. § 36):

Quántumst hominum óptumorum óptume in témpore
Áduenis. HEG. Néscio quem ád portum náuctus es
Úbi cenes, eó fastidis.

837. **Fastidis.** Brix supposes that Ergasilus' exaggerated language in the preceding line makes Hegio accuse him of taking airs. But I fancy Hegio is merely verifying his previous surmises (vv. 805—6, 811—12).

838. **Manum?**, with ictus on the final syllable, as is so often the case in astonished queries, e.g. *Most.* 595 A. *Non dat, non debet.* B. *Non debét?*, Trin. 941 A. *Sub solio Iouis?* B. *Ita dico.* (Cf. Appendix § 7.)

[redacted]

ERG. Gaude. HEG. Quid ego gaudeam? ERG. Quia ego impero, age, gaude modo.
HEG. Pol maerores mi anteuortunt gaudiis. ERG. Noli irascier.
Iam ego ex corpore exigam omnis maculas maerorum tibi.
Gaude audacter. HEG. Gaudeo, etsi nil scio quod gaudeam.
ERG. Bene facis. iube— HEG. Quid iubeam? ERG. Ignem ingentem fieri.

---

839. •h• Gaude *E* (*etiam proximis versibus et subinde* •h• *parasitum*, h *senem ac denique* E *illum*, •E• *Hegionem notans*) imperio *VE* 840. merores *libri* mihi *libri* (michi *J*) 841. merorum *libri* 842. nichil *EJ* quid *J*

---

839. **Quid ego gaudeam? Quia ego impero.** *Quia* is far more frequent than *quod* in the sense of 'because' in Plautus, and is the Conjunction regularly used in answers to questions beginning with an Interrogative word, e.g. vv. 174, 670, 705, 716, 884, 985.

840. **Gaudiis**, to be scanned as a dactyl, a scansion permissible in the first foot of the hemistich (see note on *gratiis*, v. 408). Many editors object to the recurrence of *noli irascier* in v. 845 (surely a most natural thing in a scene of this kind) and suppose the phrase to have found its way wrongly into this line. Kriege would substitute for it *gaude modo*.

841. **Omnis maculas maerorum**, 'every tinge of sorrow,' an unusual phrase, employed for comic effect. Cf. *Poen.* 198 *Inest amoris macula huic homini in pectore.* **Ex corpore.** We should rather say 'from your mind.' Cf. *Mil.* 783 *facetiarum cor corpusque plenum*, 617 *facinus meum cor corpusque macerat.*

843. The slave who brings the good news in the *Plutus* of Aristophanes makes peremptory demands of the same sort (v. 644):

Ταχέως, ταχέως φέρ' οἶνον, ὦ δέσποιν', ἵνα
Καὐτὴ πίῃς· φιλεῖς δὲ δρῶσ' αὐτὸ σφόδρα·
Ὡς ἀγαθὰ συλλήβδην ἅπαντά σοι φέρω.

We have in the *Stichus* a parallel scene (II. ii.) to this scene of the *Captivi.* The slave, Pinacium, hurries along the street to report to his mistress, Panegyris, the arrival of her long-absent husband, threatens violence to the door if it is not opened on the instant, and when he finds Panegyris, proceeds to issue orders in the fashion of Ergasilus (vv. 352 sqq.):

HEG. Ignem ingentem? ERG. Ita dico, magnus ut sit. HEG. Quid? me, uolturi,
Tuan causa aedis incensurum censes? ERG. Noli irascier.
Iuben an non iubes astitui aulas, patinas elui,

---

844. Ignem (nem B^3 *ut vid. in ras.*) *B* *post* dico 2 *litt.* (ut?) *ras. in B* me *om. E* uolturi *ex* uult- *B*: uoluri *VE* 845. Tuan] *J n. l.* aedis *Gruterus*: me aedis (edis *E*, aedes *J*) *libri* 846. Iube an non iube *V* *post* patinas *ras.* 5—7 *litt. ut vid. J* eliu *E*

A. Ecquis huc effert nassiternam cum aqua? *B.* Sine suffragio
Populi tamen aedilitatem hic quidem gerit. *A.* Age tu ocius
Pinge humum, consperge ante aedis...
...alii ligna caedite,
Alii piscis depurgate, quos piscator attulit,
Pernam et glandium deicite.

Bene facis, 'thank you.' Donatus ad Ter. *Eun.* I. ii. 106 (186): *non iudicantis est sed gratias agentis.* "It does not mean 'quite right,' which would be *recte facis.*" Morris. **Iube.** Some editors take exception to the unusual scansion *iubĕ*. But it is to be expected here, for Ergasilus pauses for a moment to consider what order should be issued first.

844. **Ita dico, magnus ut sit,** 'yes! a large one.' **Volturi.** The vulture typified ravening greed to the Romans as the cormorant does to us. Cf. *Trin.* 101:

Tum autem sunt alii qui te uolturium uocant:
Hostisne an ciuis comedis, parui pendere.

Also *Truc.* 337. This is a rare instance of the Voc. Sing. of a Masc. IO-stem; so some would substitute *uolture*. But though *volturus, -i* (later *uoltur, -is*) is found in Enn. *A.* 138 M.: *Volturus in spinis miserum mandebat homonem,* the form *uolturius* is found in the other occurrences of the word in Plautus. A better substitution, if one were necessary, would be *uolturis* (a variant in the line of Ennius) (see note on v. 96).

845. *Aul.* 361 *cenaene causa...Nos nostras aedis postulas comburere?* (in a somewhat different context).

846. **Iuben an non iubes,** a common type of peremptory demand, e.g. *Mil.* 449 *Mittin me an non mittis?*, Pers. 533 *Tacen an non taces?*, Truc. 755 *Redin an non redis?* Terence apparently prefers not to repeat the verb, e.g. *Andr.* 186 *Hocin agis an non?* Cf. *Curc.* 566 *reddin an non uirginem?*, Rud. 1399 *Tacen an non?*, Aul. 660 *Abin an non?*, Truc. 825 *Dicin an non?* **Aulas.** Since Hiatus at the Diaeresis of a Trochaic

[redacted]

Laridum atque—epulas foueri foculis feruentibus?
Alium pisces praestinatum abire? HEG. Hic uigilans somniat.
ERG. Alium porcinam atque agninam et pullos gallinaceos?
HEG. Scis bene esse, si sit unde. ERG. Pern<ul>am atque opthalmiam,

847. Lardum *ex* Larridum *ras. B*: Laridarum *E*: ( )dum *J* ac pernas *Schoellius* 848. prestinatum *B* (*in ras. et cum* 3—4 *litt. ras.*) *VJ* 849. portinam atque agminam *J* 850. si *s. v. E* pernulam *Geppertus*: pernam *libri* opthalmia *libri*

Septenarius is legitimate (Introd. iii. § 18), there is no reason for substituting the un-Plautine form *auxillas*. **Elui.** *Aul.* 270 *uascula intus pure propera atque elue*, Pseud. 162 *tu argentum eluito.*

847. **Laridum atque epulas** is an extravagant combination. But it is not out of keeping with the style of Ergasilus' remarks throughout this Scene. Schoell reads *ac* (better *atque*, to be pronounced *ac*) *pernas.* The two words *pernas* and (*e*)*pulas* would be liable to confusion when written in minuscule contracted form. **Foculis.** The Neut. Plural *fŏcula* (from *foveo*, to warm; cf. *fomentum*, *fomes*) is explained by Nonius, p. 10 M.: '*Focula' dicta sunt nutrimenta; unde et 'foculare' dicitur, ut fovere*, with quotation of Plaut. *Pers.* 104: *At edes; nam iam intus uentris fumant focula.* (By *nutrimenta* he seems to mean *nutrimenta ignis.*)

848. **Praestinatum.** Paul. Fest. 280. 4 Th.: '*Praestinare' apud Plautum praeemere est, id est emendo tenere.* The word is rare, and is apparently brought into requisition in this line for the sake of the alliteration. Similarly *Pseud.* 169 *Ego eo in macellum, ut piscium quidquid ibist pretio praestinem.* In *Epid.* 277, the only other instance of the word in Plautus, the Compound with the Preposition *prae* is required by the sense: *Ut enim praestines argento, prius quam ueniat filius.* Cf. *destinare.* **Vigilans somniat,** "'is dreaming while he is awake,' i.e. is talking nonsense; *Amph.* 697; cf. *astans somniat*, Men. 395. This should be distinguished from *uigilans dormit*, 'is sleeping while he seems to be awake,' i.e. is stupid, *Pseud.* 386. Cf. *vigilans stertis* Lucr. iii. 1048." Morris.

850. **Bene esse,** 'to enjoy oneself.' *Men.* 485 *Minore numquam bene fui dispendio*, Truc. 741. Cf. *Merc.* 583 *quin ergo imus atque obsonium Curamus, pulchre ut simus?*, and see note on v. 271. We have the other construction, *bene est mihi*, in *Pers.* 30, *Pseud.* 1135, *Trin.* 352, &c. **Unde,** 'the wherewithal,' e.g. *Mil.* 676 *Deum uirtutest te unde hospitio accipiam apud me comiter*, Pers. 302 *Paratum iam esse dicito unde argentum sit*

Horaeum, scombrum et trygonum et cetum et mollem caseum?

HEG. Nominandi istorum tibi erit magis quam edundi copia

Hic apud me, Ergasile. ERG. Mean me causa hoc censes dicere?

---

851. Horraeum *V*: Horreum *EJ ut vid.* trigonum *libri* 852. quem *V*

---

futurum, like Gk. ὁπόθεν, e.g. Philetaerus *Com.* fr. 7 K. ἐὰν ἔχῃ τις ὁπόθεν. Probably the word in this use was less of an enclitic than the ordinary Relative Adverb. This would account for the scansion in *Men.* 53 *Sed ita út det únde cúrari id possít sibi*, Truc. 146 *Ubi núm est scripturam únde dént, incúsant publicános.* (See Introd. ii. § 14.) **Pernulam** is substituted by Geppert for *pernam* of the MSS. (On the confusion of Derivative and Simple Nouns in our MSS. see note on v. 665.) Other suggestions are *pernam*<*que*>, and *pernam* <*alium*>. If we retain *pernam* here, we must suppose Ergasilus to pause a moment for reflection (Introd. ii. § 44). Leo thinks the name of some fish (e.g. *percam*) is required. And yet the mention of ham at the beginning of a list of fish is surely no more peculiar than the mention of cheese (v. 851) at the end of it. **Opthalmiam.** This is the *oculata* of Plin. *N. H.* xxxii. 149. The spelling of the MSS. should be retained (*opth-*). The double aspirate in loan-words from the Greek was in Latin replaced by the mute with the aspirate; e.g. *dipthongus*, *autocthones*, *Erectheus* are the normal Latin spellings. (For statistics see Schulze, *Orthogr.* 1894.)

851. **Horaeum,** probably pronounced with short penultimate (Introd. ii. § 6). **Trygonum.** Gk. τρυγών took in the Latin of Plautus' day the form *trugonus* (cf. *Latona* for Gk. Λητώ or Λατώ), as Gk. κῆτος, -εος, a term used of any of the larger fish, took the form *cetus*, *-i* (*Aul.* 375). A derivative of the latter word, *cetarius*, 'a fishmonger' (*genus piscatorum quod maiores pisces capit*, Nonius, p. 49 M.), occurs in Ter. *Eun.* 257 *cupedinarii omnes, Cetarii, lanii, coqui, fartores, piscatores.*

852. **Nominandi istorum...copia.** "So Ter. *Heaut.* 29 *nouarum spectandi copia*; Lucr. v. 1225 *poenarum solvendi tempus*; Varro *R. R.* ii. 1 *principium generandi animalium*, and about ten cases in other authors, chiefly in Cicero. The governing word is one which takes an objective genitive (*facultas*, *cupidus*, *cupiens*, *causa*, &c.), the gerund is always from a transitive verb." Morris. See note on v. 1008.

853. **Hic apud me.** We should perhaps replace *me* by the older form *med*, a form constantly modernized in our MSS. of Plautus. This puts the

HEG. Nec nihil hodie nec multo plus tu hic edes, ne frustra sis.
Proin tu tui cottidiani uicti uentrem ad me afferas.
ERG. Quin ita faciam, ut tute cupias facere sumptum, etsi ego uetem.
HEG. Egone? ERG. Tu ne. HEG. Tum tu mi igitur erus es. ERG. Immo beneuolens.

---

854. nichil *EJ*: mihi *V* 855. *versum laudant Nonius p.* 484, 10 (*s. v.* victi) 'pro...adferas,' *Priscianus inst.* VI *p.* 258, 15 *H.* (victi *testans*) 'proin... adferas' Proin tui tu *codd. Prisciani*: Pro uicti *codd. Nonii* cottidiani (tt *ex* ct) *B*: cotidiani *VJ*: quottidiani *E* 856. fatiam *E* tute cupias *Bothius, Bentleius*: te cupias *libri* (recupias *E*: te capias J^1, *corr.* J^2) facerem *V* 857. mi igitur *B in ras.* mihi *J* herus *J*

Personal Pronoun, which was probably emphasized, under the ictus: *Híc apud méd, Ergásile* (cf. *Cist.* 501 *híc apŭd nós*, and see Introd. ii. § 19).

854. **Ne frustra sis**, a common phrase (see note on v. 14). *Frustră* is the Plautine form of the Adverb (cf. Plaut. *contră*, and see Introd. ii. § 5), apparently Acc. Plur. Neut. (cf. *torva tueri*) of a stem *frustro-*, whence *frustrari*. It occurs in Plautus usually with the Substantive Verb, while with other Verbs *nequiquam* is used. *Frustra sum* (cf. note on v. 271) is avoided by classical writers. Sallust puts it in the mouth of the uneducated Marius (*Jug.* 85, 6 *uti...illi frustra sint*).

855. **Cottidiani.** *Trin.* 890 A. *Quid est tibi nomen, adulescens?* B. *Pax, id est nomen mihi. Hoc cotidianumst.* **Victi.** In the careless talk of every-day life the Fourth Declension seems to have been greatly merged in the Second, an anticipation of the state of things reflected in the Romance languages. The normal Gen. Sing. ending of Fourth Declension stems in the Dramatists of the Republic is *-i*; and even Quintilian (I. vi. 27) in the first cent. A.D. declares it impossible to decide whether *senati* or *senatūs* is the proper Genitive of *senatus*. In Plautus the U-stems appear mostly in the Nom. Acc. and Abl. Sing. (less frequently in the last), and so are often hardly distinguishable from O-stems (see note on v. 826).

856. **Faciam** Fut. Ind. Cf. *Truc.* 815 *Idem istuc ipsa, etsi tu taceas, reapse expertus intellego*, Aul. 421 *Pol etsi taceas, palam id quidemst.* We have the Ind. after *etsi* in vv. 543, 744, 842, &c.

857. **Egone? Tu ne**, a common use of 'affirmative' *ne*; cf. *Trin.* 634 A. *Egone?* B. *Tu ne*, &c. "This is the asseverative particle *nē*, which, except in the above cases, precedes the pronoun, and it is also joined with

Vin te faciam fortunatum? HEG. Malim quam miserum quidem.
ERG. Cedo manum. HEG. Em manum. ERG. Di te omnes adiuuant. HEG. Nihil sentio.
ERG. Non enim es in senticeto, eo non sentis. sed iube
Vasa tibi pura apparari ad rem diuinam cito,
Atque agnum afferri proprium pinguem. HEG. Cur? ERG. Ut sacrufices.

---

858. fatiam *E* furtunatum J^1 (*corr.* J^2) malum *J* 859. Credo *VE* hem *J* dii *J* omnes *ex* omnis *E* adiuuant B^2 *ut vid.* *J*: adiuuent *ceteri* *verba* nihil (nichil *EJ*: |||nihil *V*) sentio *in libris incipiunt v.* 860 862. pinguem *in ras.* *B* ERG. *ex* Est *V*

---

edepol, *hercle*, &c." Morris. **Mi** Dat. should not be changed to *mei* Gen. See note on v. 528.

858. **Malim quam miserum quidem.** For the contracted form of expression cf. *Rud.* 570 A. *Intro rumpam iam huc in Veneris fanum.* B. *In barathrum mauelim*, Truc. 422 A. *usque ero Assiduo.* B. *Immo hercle uero accubuo mauelim.* Both *malim* and *mauelim*, *malo* and *mauolo* occur in Plautus, but *malo*, *malim*, &c. are predominant later. *Mauolo* is found only once in Terence (at the end of a line, *Hec.* 540). *Mallem* does not appear in Plautus, only *mauellem*. It was apparently not reduced by the ordinary process of phonetic change, but adapted to the form of *malo*, *malim*.

860. **In senticeto**, with allusion to the joke in v. 188 (cf. v. 884).

861. **Vasa...pura**, a requisite for a sacrifice. Cf. *Amph.* 1126:

Abi domum, iube uasa pura actutum adornari mihi,
Ut Iouis supremi multis hostiis pacem petam,

Aul. 270.

862. **Proprium.** The word was tampered with by various editors until the discovery of the inscription with the regulations for the Ludi Saeculares of Augustus, which contains the sentence: *bovem marem Iovi Opt. Max. proprium immolavit*, and thus shews that *proprius* was a technical term of priestly language. *Proprius* is a compound of *pro* and *privus*, an O. Lat. equivalent of 'singulus,' and as such must have had originally a long paenultima. It has this scansion in this line and probably in others of Plautus: *Trin.* 1130 *Nám benefícium, hominí próprium quód datur, prosúm perit*, Merc. 338 (bacchiac) *Propríum nequít mi euenire <id> quod cúpio* (Introd. ii. § 6).

HEG. Cui deorum? ERG. Mihi hercle, nam ego nunc tibi sum summus Iuppiter,
Idem ego sum Salus, Fortuna, Lux, Laetitia, Gaudium.
Proin tu deum hunc saturitate facias tranquillum tibi.
HEG. Esurire mihi uidere. ERG. Miquidem esurio, non tibi. 866
HEG. Tuo arbitratu, facile patior. ERG. Credo, consuetu's puer.

---

863. ercle *E* 864. sum *s. v. J* fortunax *VE*[1] (*corr. E*[2] *ut vid.*) *J* leticia *B*: laeticia *V*: letitia *EJ* 865. diuum *Bothius* fatias *E* tranquillum *ex* tranquu- *B* 866. mihi quidem *libri* 867. HEG. *add. Pylades*: *om. libri* (*J n. l.*) ERG. *Pylades*: HEG. *libri* credo *om. J*

863—5. *Pseud.* 327:

A. Pseudole, i, arcesse hostias,
Victumas, lanios, ut ego huic sacruficem summo Ioui;
Nam hic mihi nunc est multo potior Iuppiter quam Iuppiter.
B. Nolo uictumas: agninis me extis placari uolo.

Asin. 713:

A. Datisne argentum? *B.* Si quidem mihi statuam et aram statuis
Atque ut deo mi hic immolas bouem: nam ego tibi Salus sum.
...*A.* Quem te autem diuom nominem? *C.* Fortunam atque Obsequentem.

Cf. *Pers.* 99.

865. Editors who take exception to the Prosodic Hiatus after *deum* (Introd. ii. § 40) substitute *diuom*; and certainly *diuom*, in the form *diuum*, would easily be changed (through *dium*) to *deum* in MSS. (cf. *Merc.* 842). It will not do to transpose *Proin deum tu hunc* (for *proin tu* is an indivisible phrase in Plautus), nor should *proin* be changed to *proinde* (see note on v. 933). **Facias tranquillum.** *Cist.* 652 *si possum tranquillum facere ex irato mihi.* The Imperative (e.g. *Amph.* 311, *Stich.* 668) may follow *proin tu*, but the Subjunctive (e.g. vv. 551, 855) is more usual in Plautus.

866. **Miquidem esurio, non tibi.** It is impossible to imagine Terence tolerating a poor joke like this; and, no doubt, to Horace this line would seem an indication of the 'non astrictus soccus' of Plautus. And yet one feels that in its setting here the reply of Ergasilus would provoke the laughter rather than the censure of any audience. Ergasilus is in that state of mind that he will and must turn to a quip each and every remark made to him.

867. Cf. v. 966, *Asin.* 703. **Tuo arbitratu.** Whether the phrase

HEG. Iuppiter te dique perdant. ERG. Te hercle—mi aequum est gratias
Agere ob nuntium; tantum ego nunc porto a portu tibi boni.
Nunc tu mihi places. HEG. Abi, stultu's, sero post tempus uenis.
ERG. Igitur olim si aduenissem, magis tu tum istuc diceres;
Nunc hanc laetitiam accipe a me, quam fero. nam filium

---

868. HEG. ς: *Hegioni continuant libri* (*J n. l.*) diique *J* perfiant *E* ercle *E* equum *E* grās (*i.e.* gratias) *ex* grat- *V* 869. boni (ni *ex corr.*) *J* 870. michi *J* 872. leticiam *B*: letitiam *EJ* nam (*ex* m-) *B*

---

should be scanned with complete elision of *tuo* (Introd. ii. § 15) or with shortening of the syllable (with secondary accent) *arb-* under the Breves Breviantes Law (Introd. ii. § 23) is open to doubt. There is a possibility of a by-form *abitratu* (cf. *increbesco* and *increbresco*). **Facile patior.** This is the usual Adverb with *patior*, e.g. *Rud.* 1100 *Omnia istaec ego facile patior* (also *Asin.* 240, 739, *Cist.* 500, *Men.* 978), though we find occasionally *aequo animo* (*Asin.* 375, *Stich.* 125). The opposite is *aegre patior* (*Asin.* 832, *Bacch.* 492, *Merc.* 251). For the other sense of *patior* cf. Novius *Com.* 19 R., Laber. *Com.* 56 R.

868. *Mil.* 286 A. *Di te perdant.* B. *Te istuc aequom—quoniam occepisti, eloqui*, Epid. 23 A. *Di te perdant.* B. *Te uolo—Percontari*, Poen. 588 A. *Di te perdant.* B. *Vos quidem hercle—cum eo cum quiqui tamen Et bene et benigne facitis*, Cas. 279 A. *Qui illum di omnes deaeque perdant.* B. *Te uxor aiebat tua—Me uocare*, Men. 328 A. *Numquid uis?* B. *Ut eas maximam malam crucem.* A. *Ire hercle meliust te—interim atque accumbere.* Cf. *Pseud.* 37. **Iuppiter...dique.** Cf. v. 922, *Aul.* 658 *Iuppiter te dique perdant*, Amph. 1021 *tibi Iuppiter Dique omnes irati certo sunt.* So in Gk. Ζεῦ καὶ θεοί. **Mi.** The MSS. retain this spelling as in v. 857. Cf. ad v. 621.

869. **Porto a portu.** *Merc.* 161 *tibi equidem a portu adporto hoc.*

870. **Tu,** i.e. *tua cena*, with reference to vv. 179 sq. **Stultu's** is more likely than *stultus* Nom. (for Voc.). Yet we have in *Asin.* 654 *di te seruassint semper, Custos erilis, decus popli, thensaurus copiarum.* The MSS. do not distinguish between *-u's* and *us.* **Sero post tempus uenis.** Hegio means that after the unpleasant occurrences of the preceding Scene he is in no mood for dinner.

871. **Igitur** had in Early Latin the sense of *tum*, &c. (Paul. Fest. 74.

Tuum modo in portu Philopolemum uiuum, saluum et sospitem
Vidi in publica celoce, ibidemque illum adulescentulum
Aleum una et tuum Stalagmum seruom, qui aufugit domo,
Qui tibi subripuit quadrimum puerum filiolum tuum.
HEG. Abi in malam rem, ludis me. ERG. Ita me amabit sancta Saturitas,
Hegio, itaque suo me semper condecoret cognomine,
Vt ego uidi. HEG. Meum gnatum? ERG. Tuum gnatum et genium meum.

---

874. *versum laudat Nonius p.* 533, 2 (*s. v.* celox) 'uidi...adulescentulum' caelote *VE*: celote *J*: celocem *codd. Nonii* ibidem (*om.* que) *codd. Nonii* adolescentulum *BJ* 875. Alium *libri* unam (unā) *J* seruom *J ut vid.*: -uum *cett.* domo *ex* domum *V* 876. surripuit *BVJ* 877. saturnitas *B* 878. Egio *libri* me *om. J* 879. Meumne gnatum *Fleckeisenus*, *Bentleius super* gnatum *alt. scriptum est* aliter aeg. *ut vid. in J* gemum (geinum?) *ut vid. J*

---

29 Tb. '*Igitur' nunc quidem pro conpletionis significatione ualet, quae est ergo. Sed apud antiquos ponebatur pro inde et postea et tum*), as in *Mil.* 772 *Quando habebo, igitur rationem mearum fabricarum dabo*, or in the first law of the XII Tab.: *Si in ius uocat, ni it, antestamino; igitur em capito.* **Olim,** before the arrival of the ship. **Si aduenissem...diceres.** Other examples of this sequence are *Asin.* 502 *atque etiam tu quoque ipse si esses percontatus Me ex aliis, scio pol crederes nunc quod fers*, Aul. 828 *Quid faceres, si repperissem?*, Bacch. 217 *Ni nanctus Venerem essem, hanc Iunonem dicerem*, Cist. 625 *Nam ni intellexes, numquam credo amitteres*, Mil. 838 *Tu hercle itidem faceres, si tibi esset credita*, Mil. 1320 *Si non mecum aetatem egisset, hodie stulta uiueret*, &c., &c.

874. **In publica celoce.** This detail seems to be thrown in by the Dramatist to minimize the violation of the Unity of Time. '*Celox' est navigium breve, ductum a celeritudine....Plautus in Poenulo* (543) '*Obsecro hercle, operam celocem hanc mihi, ne corbitam date*,' Nonius, p. 532 M.

875. **Tuum Stalagmum seruom.** This is the normal arrangement of words in such phrases, e.g. *Amph.* 1077 *tua Bromia ancilla*, Cist. 544 *mei Lampadisci serui*, Bacch. 346 *meus Mnesilochus filius*, &c. Departures from it are due to metrical necessity, e.g. *Trin.* 1140 *Meo datu tibi ferre et gnato Lesbonico aibat meo* (cf. ad v. 881).

879. **Meum gnatum,** with the metrical ictus on the final syllable, as

HEG. Et captiuom illum Alidensem? ERG. Μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω. HEG Et seruolum
Meum Stalagmum, meum qui gnatum surripuit? ERG. Ναὶ τὰν Κόραν.
HEG. Iam diu— ERG. Ναὶ τὰν Πραινέστην. HEG. Venit? ERG. Ναὶ τὰν Σιγνέαν.

880—883. *graeca verba latinis litteris scripta sunt in libris* 880. HEG. B^3: *om. ceteri* captiuom *J*: -uum *cett.* ERG. B^3: HEG. *ceteri* HEG. B^3: ERG. *ceteri* (*ex* Et *ut vid. V*) et *BJ*: ut *VE* 881. HEG. *praem.* B^1VEJ: *corr.* B^3 stalagmum *ex* stalamum *E* ERG. *add.* B^3 : *om. cett.* coram *libri val hic et infra cum Valla et Saraceno Schroederus in progr. gymn. Mariaewerder. a.* 1853 *p.* 17 *Cobetusque Nov. lect. p.* 652: ne *libri* 882. HEG. B^3: ERG. *ceteri* ERG. B^3: HEG. *ceteri* ne tam prenestem *libri* (ne tan praenestem *J*) HEG. B^3: ERG. *ceteri* ERG. B^3: HEG. *ceteri* ne *libri* tan *B*: tam *VEJ* signeam *libri*

is so often the case in surprised or indignant questions (see note on v. 838). The proposed reading *meumne gnatum* is not supported by the parallel passage in Ter. *Haut.* 430:

A. Num quid nam de gnato meo audisti, Chremes?
B. Valet atque uiuit. *A.* Ubi namst quaeso? *B.* Apud me domi.
A. Meus gnatus? *B.* Sic est. *A.* Venit? *B.* Certe.

Tuum gnatum et genium meum. Cf. *Stich.* 372 A. *Tuom uirum.* B. *Et uitam meam*, Bacch. 495 *serua tibi sodalem et mihi filium.* So in expressions of combined relationship, e.g. Ter. *Phorm.* 199 *huius patrem...et patruom tuom*, Trin. 111, &c. For *genius* applied to a patron, &c., cf. *Curc.* 301 *Phaedromum genium meum*, Men. 138 A. *Quid agis.* B. *Teneo dextera genium meum.*

880. **Alidensem.** Elsewhere in the play the Adj. used is *Aleus.* Similarly in the *Pseudolus* the normal Adj. *Macedonius* is in one line (v. 1041) replaced by *Macedoniensis.* **Μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω.** *Most.* 973.

881. **Seruolum | Meum Stalagmum.** For this departure from the normal order (see note on v. 875) cf. *Truc.* 405 sq. *tonstricem Suram Nouisti nostram?*, where the phrase is similarly divided between two lines.

882. The accident that Κόρα, 'Proserpine,' was also the name of a town, the Volscian Cora, suggests a string of geographical oaths to the excited brain of Ergasilus. **Iam diu.** Since it appears from *Trin.* 609 *tam modo, inquit Praenestinus*, that in the Praenestine dialect the particle *tam* (deictic) was used for emphasis, it has been suggested that it was the phrase *tam diu*, and not the *iam diu* of the MSS., that elicited the ναὶ τὰν Πραινέστην of Ergasilus. But since we cannot suppose Hegio to have lapsed into countrified parlance in his excitement, his *tam diu* would require some such verb as *latuit*, instead of *uenit.*

882. **Σιγνέαν.** The spelling of the MSS. should be retained (as also in

HEG. Certon? ERG. Ναὶ τὰν Φρουσινῶνα. HEG. Vide sis. ERG. Ναὶ τὸν Ἀλάτριον.
HEG. Quid tu per barbaricas urbes iuras? ERG. Quia enim item asperae
Sunt ut tuum uictum autumabas esse. HEG. Vae aetati tuae!
ERG. Quippe quando mihi nihil credis, quod ego dico sedulo.

---

883. HEG. *praem.* B^3: *Hegioni continuant ceteri* ERG. B^3: *Hegioni continuant cett.* ne *libri* tan *J*: tam *ceteri* (B^3 *in ras.*): τὸν *Leo* frusinonem *B*: frusi non est *VEJ* HEG. B^3: ERG. *ceteri* ERG. B^3: HEG. *ceteri* ne *libri* tam B^3 *in ras.*: tan *J* alatrium *libri* (alatrina *E*)
884. HEG. B^3: ERG. *VEJ* per *om. VEJ* barraricas *VE* ERG. B^3: HEG. *ceteri* enim item *B in ras.*: e. ite *E* aspere *libri* (*J n. l.*)
885. HEG. *Saracenus*: ERG. *libri* ue *BE post ras. J*: ille *VE ante ras.*
886. ERG. *Saracenus*: *om. libri* michi *J* nichil *EJ*

Truc. 690 *conea*), for the dialectal equivalents of Latin *-ia*, *-ius*, *-ium* often shew *e* for Lat. *i*. *Aleum* is the 'rustic' form of *alium*, 'garlic' (*aleato* Most. 48). (See my *Latin Language* ch. II. § 10.)

883. **Vide sis** (cf. ad v. 643). Leo prints τὸν Φρ....τὸν Ἀλ.; Brix τὰν Φρ....τὰν Ἀλ., supposing that all the town-names follow the analogy of τὰν Κόραν.

884. **Barbaricas**, i.e. 'Italian,' a standing joke of Plautus (cf. v. 492). Indeed this is the prevailing use of the word *barbarus* and its cognates in his plays. We have however the sense 'barbarous,' 'uncivilised,' in *Bacch.* 121 *o Lyde, es barbarus, Quem ego sapere nimio censui plus quam Thalem* (but v. 123 *I stultior es barbaro poticio*), and in the other dramatists, e.g. Caecil. *Com.* 59 R. *Quid narras, barbare, indomitis cum moribus, Inlitterate, inlex?* Plautus, no doubt, found it convenient to remind his audience that his plays were adaptations from the Greek. Cf. *Stich.* 446:

> Atque id ne uos miremini, hominis seruolos
> Potare, amare atque ad cenam condicere,
> Licet haec Athenis nobis;

cf. *Cas.* prol. 67:

> Sunt hic, inter se quos nunc credo dicere
> Quaeso hercle, quid istuc est? seruiles nuptiae?
> ...At ego aio id fieri in Graecia...

885. Cf. v. 188. **Vaé aetatí tuae**, a variety of *vae tibi*. Cf. *Poen.* 783 *Vae uostrae aetati*, Rud. 375 *Vae capiti atque aetati tuae*. Commoner is *uaé capití tuo*.

886. **Quippe quando**. The disyllabic pronunciation of *quippe* (Introd.

Sed Stalagmus quoius erat tunc nationis, cum hinc abit?
HEG. Siculus. ERG. At nunc Siculus non est, Boius est, boiam terit:

---

887. quo iusserat B^1 (*corr.* B^3) *VE*: cuius erat *J* tunc B^3: nunc *ceteri* hinc B^3J: hic *ceteri* abit *B*: abiit *ceteri* 888. HEG. B^3: *om. ceteri* Sicuius *libri* (Cuius *J*): *corr. Camerarius* ERG. B^3: *om. ceteri* (*post* nunc *add. J*) at *Camerarius*: et *libri* Siculus *Camerarius*: sicuius *libri* non] nunc *J* boius B^3 *ut vid.*: bolus *ceteri*

---

ii. § 14) is normal in the phrases *quippe qui*, *quippe quom*, *quippe quando*. Cf. *quippini*. **Sedulo**, from *sē* (a Preposition used in Early Lat. in the sense of its cognate *sine*) and *dolo*, Abl. of *dolus*. Cf. *se dulo malo* on the Lex Agraria (*C. I. L.* i. 200. 40). With *dico sedulo* of this line compare Men. 228 *non dicam dolo*, Trin. 90 *haud dicam dolo*, 480 *non tibi dicam dolo*. From the Adverb *sedulo*, which is more common with *facio* than with *dico* (Ter. *Phorm.* 453 *ego sedulo hunc dixisse credo*) in Plautus, was formed the Adj. *sedulus*.

887. **Quoius.** Cf. ad v. 809. **Abit** is probably Present, to judge from lines like *Amph.* 668 (quoted in note on v. 282), *Men.* 29 *Tarenti ludi forte erant, quom illuc uĕnit*, 1115. *Quot eras annos gnatus tum, quom te pater a patria auehit?*, 1136 *Hunc censebat te esse quom uocat te ad prandium*, Merc. 616 *Iam abducta erat quom ad portam uenio*, &c.

888. **At** (*et* MSS.). The adversative force of *et* in sentences like *Pers.* 762 *beneficium scit accipere et reddere nescit*, Most. 50 *Decet med amare et te bubulcitarier* hardly warrants us in retaining the reading of the MSS. here. Another suggestion is *sed*, written in some archetype *set*. **Boius.** The Celtic Boii were finally defeated and destroyed at the battle of Mutina 193 B.C.; and their country became the province of Gallia Cisalpina. The allusion to them here is therefore very natural. **Boiam.** Paul. Fest. 25. 30 Th. '*Boiae*,' *id est genus uinculorum, tam ligneae, quam ferreae dicuntur*; Isidor. *Orig.* v. 27. 12 '*Boia*,' *id est torques damnatorum, quasi iuga boum ex genere vinculorum*; Prudentius *Psychom.* praef. 34 *attrita boiis colla.* The word recurs in *Asin.* 550:

Aduorsum stimulos, lamminas, crucesque compedesque,
Neruos, catenas, carceres, numellas, pedicas, boias.

"It is identified with the κλοιός of the Greeks by Jerome (*Comm. in Jeremiam* 5, 27 κλοιούς...*sermone vulgari boias vocant*) and the author of the Greek-Latin Glossary (*C. G. L.* ii. p. 350). If this is right, it gives us a sufficient notion of its form, which is that of a forked stick." (Allen in *Harvard Studies* vii. 45.) **Terit.** Cf. *Pers.* 420 *compedium tritor*,

[redacted]

Liberorum quaerundorum causa ei, credo, uxor datast.
Heg. Dic, bonan fide tu mi istaec uerba dixisti? Erg. Bona.
Heg. Di inmortales, iterum gnatus uideor, si uera autumas.
Erg. Ain tu? dubium habebis etiam, sancte quom ego iurem tibi?
Postremo, Hegio, si parua iuri iurandost fides,
Vise ad portum. Heg. Facere certumst. tu intus cura quod opus est.
Sume, posce, prome quid uis. te facio cellarium.
Erg. Nam hercle, nisi mantiscinatus probe ero, fusti pectito.

---

889. querundorum *libri* data est *VEJ* 890. *post* Dic *sequitur* ei *expunct. in E* bonam *V* mihi *libri* (michi *J*) istec *libri* (*corr. J*) 891. Dii *J* immortales *BVJ* si uara *B*[1] (*corr. B*[3]) (*vix* uaera *B*[3]) 892. Ain tu *ex* Ain *B*: An tu *ex* Ain tu *ras. in E* sanctae *libri* cum *J* 893. egio *B*[1] (*corr. B*[3] *ut vid.*) *J* uiri iurando est *V*: iuri iurando est *J* 894. Vis erat *V*: Vis eat *ex* Vis erat *ras. E ut vid.* certunst *BE*: certum est *VJ* 895. ius *VE* te *ex* ste *ut vid. B* fatio *VE* 896. Erg. *praem. B*[3]: *om. ceteri* ercle *E* hero fuisti *J* plectito *B*[3]

Trin. 1022 *ferriteri.* For the other sense of *tero* cf. Prop. III. xi. 30, Petron. 87. 8.

890. **Bonan fide**, the current expression. It gives occasion for a pun in *Most.* 670:

> *A.* Tuos emit aedis filius. *B.* Bonan fide?
> *A.* Siquidem tu argentum reddituru's, tum bona,
> Si redditurus non es, non emit bona.

891. *Poen.* 1077 *Iterum mihi gnatus uideor, quia te repperi.*

892. **Quom ego iurem.** For the Subjunctive with Adversative *quom* cf. *Pseud.* 184 *Eo uos uostrosque pantices adeo madefactatis, quom ego sim hic siccus*, Rud. 1124 *Vidi petere miluom, etiam quom nil auferret tamen* (cf. *Most.* 896, *Trin.* 733, Ter. *Andr.* 944).

893. **Parua est fides.** In other occurrences of this phrase (*Bacch.* 570, *Pseud.* 467, 477, Ter. *Eun.* 197) we have the variant *parum*, which will not scan unless we are to restore the old form *parvum* (cf. *boum*, older *bovum*, *Gnaeus*, older *Gnaevus*). Editors substitute *parua.*

896. **Nam**, 'true! for,' &c., a common use of the Conjunction. So

HEG. Aeternum tibi dapinabo uictum, si uera autumas.
ERG. Vnde id? HEG. A me meoque gnato. ERG. Sponden tu istuc? HEG. Spondeo.
ERG. At ego tuum tibi aduenisse filium respondeo.
HEG. Cura quam optume potes.—ERG. Bene ambula et redambula.

---

897. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 162 'aeternum...uictum' HEG. *praem.* B^2: *om. ceteri* autumnas *J* 898. Vude *J* a me] ante *V* sponden ς: sponde *libri* istud *libri*: *corr. Schmidtius de pron. p.* 84 900. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 33 'bene...redeambula' aquam *B ante ras.* petes *EJ*

---

namque, v. 604, *Trin.* 731, &c. **Mantiscinatus.** "The verb occurs only here and in the commentary of Donatus on Ter. *Eun.* ii. 2. 27 (258), *cum de alieno manticinor* [-*ssi*-, -*sci*-] *et expendo.*" Morris (cf. *Rhein. Mus.* liv. 638). It is formed on the pattern of *vaticinor*, *lenocinor*, *patrocinor*, *ratiocinor*, &c. **Pectito.** The alliterative phrase *pugnis pectere* is not uncommon (*Men.* 1017, *Poen.* 358, *Rud.* 661). We have *fuste dolare* in Hor. *S.* I. v. 22.

898. **Id**, referring to *uictum* (v. 897). This loose relation of the Pronoun to its antecedent is common in colloquial Latin. Cf. *Trin.* 153 (*thensaurum...id*), *Aul.* 109 (*nummos...id*), 712 (*aulam...hoc*), *Bacch.* 126 (*ornatus...haec*), and see notes on vv. 196, 925. **A me.** *Men.* 545 *Da sodes abs te*, Pseud. 735 *possum a me dare.* In *Trin.* 328 we have *de meo*:

> *A.* Bene uolo ego illi facere, si tu non neuis. *B.* Nempe de tuo?
> *A.* De meo.

Istuc. See note on v. 964. **Sponden tu istuc? Spondeo,** the legal formula. Cf. *Poen.* 1157 A. *Spondesne igitur?* B. *Spondeo*, Aul. 256 A. *Sponden ergo?* B. *Spondeo*, Curc. 674 A. *Spondesne, miles, mi hanc uxorem?* B. *Spondeo.* We may therefore correct with confidence the *sponde tu* of the MSS., especially as -*n* is often omitted by scribes of Plautus. (For some examples see Morris, *Sentence-Question in Plautus*, p. 24).

900. **Redambula,** a coinage for the nonce. See note on v. 767, and cf. Afran. *Com.* 5 R. *Simul limen intrabo, illi 'extrabunt' illico*, Most. 1031 A. *numquid Tranio Turbauit?* B. *Immo 'exturbauit' omnia*, Most. 1112 *Non radicitus quidem hercle, uerum etiam 'exradicitus.'*

Hegio leaves the stage by the left-hand door (from the spectators) for the harbour.

[redacted]

<Ergasilvs> parasitus. IV. iii.

Erg. Illic hinc abiit, mihi rem summam credidit cibariam.
Di inmortales, iam ut ego collos praetruncabo tegoribus!

IV. iii. Parasitvs *libri* (Ergasilvs *in fine v.* 901 *J*): *correxi*
901. illic *c. sp. in. B*: llic (*om. sp. in.*) *V*: llic *c. sp. in. E* hinc *ex* hic *V* habiit *J* michi *E* sumam *J* tibariam *VE ante ras.*: cybariam *J* 902. Dii *J* immortales *BVJ* iam *om. J* pretruncabo *B*: pertruncabo *VEJ* tegoribus *Turnebus Adv.* xxii 6: tergoribus *libri*

Act IV. Scene iii. (Trochaic Septenarii). Ergasilus is left on the stage, master of the situation. In

> "A temper known to those, who, after long
> And weary expectation, have been blest
> With sudden happiness beyond all hope,"

he remains for a time

> "with wise restraint
> Voluptuous, fearless of a rival,"

and reviews his prospect of a banquet. At last he dashes into the house.

A minute or two would elapse before the next Scene. Brix suggests that it may have been occupied by a musical interlude, as in the *Pseudolus*, where at the conclusion of Act i. Sc. v. Pseudolus goes into the house with the words:

> Concedere aliquantisper hinc mi intro lubet,
> Dum concenturio in corde sycophantias.
> <Sed mox> exibo, non ero uobis morae:
> Tibicen uos interibi hic delectauerit.

But I take it that a succession of crash and clatter from behind the stage, where Ergasilus is supposed to be foraging among the crockery in the kitchen, would sufficiently occupy the attention of the audience in the limited interval that would be necessary.

The Scene-heading in our MSS. is probably not the original Scene-heading (see Introd. i. § 14). In other cases where a speaker in the previous Scene is left on the stage, the word restitit is found in various MSS. of the Palatine recension, in *Cist.* i. ii. lena restitit, in *Bacch.* iv. iii. advlescens restit<it>.

901. **Rem summam...cibariam**, a parody of *res summa publica* (e.g. *Merc.* 986). Ergasilus, like Stasimus in the *Trinummus* (v. 482), puts food quite on a par with politics (cf. vv. 153 sqq.).

902. **Collos.** See note on v. 357. The tit-bits which Ergasilus was after were the *glandia* (v. 915). **Praetruncabo.** Cf. ad v. 519.

Quanta pernis pestis ueniet, quanta labes larido,
Quanta sumini absumedo, quanta callo calamitas,
Quanta laniis lassitudo, quanta porcinariis!
Nam si alia memorem, quae ad uentris uictum conducunt, morast.
Nunc ibo, ut pro praefectura mea ius dicam larido,

---

903. ueniet...larido *in ras. in B* (*add.* B^3 *ut vid.*) largido J^1 (*corr.* J^2 *ut vid.*) 904. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 130 'quanta...calamitas' Quanto *J* absumedo *Valla*: absumendo *libri* quanto *J ante corr.* callo B^3J: collo *ceteri* calamitas (a *alt. ex corr.*) *J* 905. *accedit A* QVANTAL^{aniis}LA^{ssi}-TVDOQ^{uan}TAPORCINARIIS *A* lanus *VE* lassitado *J* portinariis *B*, *sed* ti B^3 *ex* u *ut vid.* 906. NAMSIALIA^{me}M^{orem}QV^{aeadu}ENTRIS^{uictu}M CONDVCVNT|MORA|||| *A* mora est *V* (*J n. l.*) 907. N^{unc}IBOVTPROP^{rae}FE^{ctu}RAMEAIVSDICAMLARIDO *A* ut pro praefectura *A*: ut praefecturam (*om.* pro) *ceteri* (pref- *B*) uis *V* (*ut vid.*) *E* (*ut vid.*)

Tegoribus. Varro derives this form from *tego* (*L. L.* v. 110 '*Tegus' suis ab eo quod eo tegitur: 'perna' a pede*, &c.), so that Lat. *tegus*, *-oris* would be a similar formation to Gk. τέγος, -εος. But it rather seems to be the same by-form of *tergoribus* as *praestigiae* of *praestrigiae*, *increbesco* of *increbresco*, &c., due to the Roman tendency to drop one of two *r*'s in successive syllables. Pompeius (283. 13 K.) mentions *mamor* as a popular mispronunciation of *marmor*. (Cf. ad v. 867.) The form *tegoribus* (required here by the metre, Introd. iii. § 17) recurs in v. 915 and *Pseud.* 198 *Nisi carnaria tria grauida tegoribus onere uberi hodie Mihi erunt*; but we have no evidence that Plautus recognized the form *tergor-*, though Ennius, if our MSS. are correct, used it (in the sense of *tergum* apparently) in his Epic (*A.* 254 M.): *tergus [igitur] sagus pinguis opertat.* (Cf. Caper 99 K. '*Terga' hominis tantum, singulariter 'tergum' facit. quadrupedum erit 'tergus,' pluraliter 'tergora,' id est coria. 'tegus' quoque inuenio dici et esse eius plurale 'tegora.'*)

904. **Absumedo,** a coinage for the nonce, on the type of *intercapedo*, &c.

905. At this line begins the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*). Its value may be seen from the critical notes on vv. 907, 1016—22, 1026, &c. *A* has preserved for us one line which has been lost in all the other MSS. (v. 912^{a}).

906. **Nam si alia memorem.** *Bacch.* 481 *Nám alia memoráre quae illum facere uidi dispudet.* See note on v. 416. **Morast.** Cf. v. 396. The Ind. is common in the Apodosis of Conditional Sentences of this type. Cf. *Poen.* 921 *nunc si eadem hic iterum iterem, inscitiast*, Men. 760 *Quas si autumem omnis, nimis longus sermost*, Trin. 1186 *Nam si pro peccatis centum ducat uxoris, parumst.*

[redacted]

Et quae pendent indemnatae pernae, is auxilium ut feram.—

PVER. IV. iv.

Pv. Diespiter te dique, Ergasile, perdant et uentrem tuum,

Parasitosque omnis, et qui posthac cenam parasitis dabit.

Cladis calamitasque, intemperies modo in nostram aduenit domum.

---

908. ETQVAEPENDENTINDEMNATAEPERNISAV^xi^LIVMVTFERĀ *A* que *B* indemnatae *A*: indemnate *ceteri* (indempnatae *J*) pernis *AJ*: perne eis B^3: pernies B^1 *ut vid. VE.*

IV. iv. *unius versus spat. A* (puer *in fine v.* 908 *J*)

909. DIESPITERTEDEIQ·ERGASILEPER^da^N^tetuent^REMTVVM *A* Diespiter B^3 *in spat.*: Iespiter *c. sp. in. V*: iespiter *c. sp. in. EJ* diique *J* 910. PARASITOSQ·OMNIS^et^QVIPOSTHACCENAMPARASITI^ed^A|||| *A* posthanc B^1 (*corr.* B^3) caenam *VJ* 911. CLADESCALAMITATESQ·INTEMPERIESMODOINNOSTRAMAD|VENITDOMVM *A* Clades *A* (-is?) *J*: Cladis *ceteri* calamitatesque (*vel* -tisque) *A*: calamitas quae *VE* modamnostram *V*: modomnostram *E*

---

907. **Pro,** 'by virtue of,' as in the phrase *pro imperio*, e.g. *Amph.* 21 *pro imperio uobis quod dictum foret*, Poen. 44 *Haec imperata quae sunt pro imperio histrico*, Ter. *Phorm.* 196 *Satis pro imperio, quisquis es.* **Praefectura mea.** Cf. *Cas.* 110 (spoken by a *vilicus*) *Ruri incubabo usque in praefectura mea.*

908. **Pernae, is** (= *iis*). The Early Latin habit of including the Noun with the Relative clause (see note on v. 1) makes this reading more likely than *pernis*, the reading of *A*. In the original from which *A* was transcribed, the words were possibly written PERNEIS and mistaken by the scribe of *A* for the old spelling of the Dat. Pl. *pernis* (see note on arg. v. 3).

Ergasilus enters the house.

Act IV. Scene iv. The metre changes to Iambic Octonarii. A slave runs out of the house (as in *Pseud.* III. i.) in great agitation and tells of the wild work of Ergasilus in the kitchen. On the interval that elapses before this Scene, see the remarks on IV. iii. In the original Scene-heading the name of the slave, who plays so unimportant a part in the play, may not have been stated.

911. **Cladis.** Whether this, the reading of our MSS., at least of the Palatine MSS., is genuine or merely a Late Latin misspelling, is uncertain. Many, if not most, of the Third Decl. Nominatives in *-es* (originally Nom.

Quasi lupus esuriens metui ne in me faceret impetum.
Vbi uoltus **sur**ntis . . . . impetum 912a

912. QVASILVPVSESVRI[ens]TIMVI[ne in]MEFACERETIMPETVM *A* timui *ut vid. A*: metui *ceteri* (*ex* metuit *V*) metui timui *Niemeyerus* ne] ut *V* 912a. VBIVOLTVS··SVR··NTIS——IMPETVM *A* *versum om. ceteri* ubi uoltus esurientis uidi, eius extimescebam impetum *Leo*

Plur.?) seem to have belonged to the diction of more elevated literature. Thus neither Plautus nor Terence uses the stems *sedes*, *rupes*, *tabes*, *caedes*, &c.; and *nubis* Nom. Sing. appears in *Merc.* 880. It is unfortunate that the reading of the Ambrosian Palimpsest in this line is not quite free from doubt. **In nostram...domum.** So *Trin.* 382 (AP), and *in nostra domo* Cas. 620 (AP), *Pseud.* 84 (AP); though in *Truc.* 261, where A has *in nostra domo*, the Palatine reading is *nostrae domi* (as in *Men.* 359, *Most.* 874, *Poen.* 838). Abraham proposes to delete *in*.

912. **Lupus esuriens** was a current phrase, like our 'ravening wolf.' Cf. *Stich.* 605 *Nam illic homo tuam hereditatem inhiat, quasi esuriens lupus*, 577 *Atque eccum tibi lupum in sermone: praesens, esuriens adest.* **Metui.** On the quantity *metŭi* see Introd. ii. § 6. The reading however is uncertain, for the Ambrosian Palimpsest seems to have *timui.* Niemeyer very plausibly combines *metui* of P and *timui* of A into *metui timui*, the same combination as in *Mil.* 1347 *Metuoque et timeo, ne hoc tandem propalam fiat nimis.* Cf. *Pseud.* 1019 *Nimisque ego illum hominem metuo et formido male.* *Timidus* and *pauidus* are similarly united in *Curc.* 649 (cf. *Rud.* 663). Cf. Cic. *Verr.* IV. 41 *metu ac timore.* For the Asyndeton cf. *Most.* 1031 *perii interii.* The suggestion *esuriens me timui* lacks a parallel to the construction of *esurio* with an Accusative; and *mi timui*, although a Terentian construction (e.g. *Haut.* 531 *tibi timui*), is perhaps not Plautine. *Male timui* (*Aul.* 208) is unlikely with *male formidabam* in the next line. *Metuo* is commoner in Plautus than *timeo*, which (though by no means rare) is found mostly in certain formulae, such as *ne time* (a suitable ending of a line), *totus timeo* (alliterative), &c. (*Timeo* and *metuo* are variants in Ter. *Haut.* 620.) Some change *quăsi* to *quāsi* or *quam si* (cf. ad v. 1024) and make the line trochaic (with *metŭi*).

912a. This line, owing to the similar ending of v. 912 (Homoeoteleuton), was omitted in some archetype of the Palatine MSS., and its existence was never suspected until the discovery of the Ambrosian Palimpsest. To what extent the same thing has happened in other parts of the play, for which the evidence of the Palimpsest is lacking, it is difficult to say. From a computation of the leaves lost in A between vv. 931 and 1008 Studemund conjectured that a good many more lines must have been contained in this part in A than appear in the other MSS. This cannot however be regarded as a certainty. Since the metre in this part is

[redacted]

Nimisque hercle ego illum male formidabam, ita frendebat dentibus.
Adueniens deturbauit totum cum carni carnarium:
Arripuit gladium, praetruncauit tribus tegoribus glandia;
Aulas calicesque omnis confregit, nisi quae modiales erant.
Cocum percontabatur, possentne seriae feruescere.
Cellas refregit omnis intus recclusitque armarium.

---

913. NIMISQ·KERCLEEGQ——M^tdAV^llta FRENDEBAT|DENTIBVS *A* ercle *E* formidaui (?) *A* 914. ADVENIENS^to TVM^deturbat CVMCARNECARNARIVM *A* totum deturbat *ut vid.* *A* carni *Bothius*: carne (-i?) *A*: carne *ceteri* 915. ARRIPVITGLADIVMPRAERVNCAVITTRIBVSTEGORIBVSGLĀDIA *A* praeruncauit (pratr-?) *A*: pretruncauit *BV*: praetruncauit *E* (*J n. l.*) tegoribus *A*: tergoribus *ceteri* 916. AVLASCALIC^es Q·OMNESCON^fr EGITNISIQVAEMODIALAE|SERANT *A* omnis *EJ ut vid.*: omnes *ceteri* confregit *AJ*: confringit *ceteri* que *V* modialaes *ut vid.* *A* 917. COCVM^pe RCO^ntab ATY^rpo SSENTNESERIAEFERVESCERE *A* percunctabatur *B* (*J n. l.*) serire *VEJ* 918. CELLASREFRE^git O ^ma i siata SRE-ÇL—— *A* reclusit *libri*

Trochaic Septenarii, long verses which would often occupy two lines instead of one in A, the exact number of lines supposed to be missing cannot be stated. It may have been as many as 40.

914. **Carni.** This spelling is required by the metre. The Abl. Sg. of the Third Declension had two forms of case-suffix, (1) -ĕ (from an original -ĭ, properly the Locative-suffix, like the Gk. -ῐ of the Dative), (2) -ī (from an original -*īd*). Of Consonant-stems with -ī in Abl. Sg. we have in Plautus, e.g. *parieti* Cas. 140 (MSS. -*e*), *pumici* Pers. 41 (MSS. -*e*) (cf. *obieci* Pers. 203).

915. **Praetruncauit.** Cf. v. 902. The apparent reading of the Palimpsest *praeruncauit* may be right, from *runcare*, 'to weed.'

917. **Seriae,** "jars for preserves, much too large for ordinary cooking purposes; but Ergasilus is represented as dissatisfied with all ordinary provisions for eating." Morris.

918. **Recclusit.** See note on v. 923. We should spell with double *c*, if for nothing else, to guard against the mistake of supposing that a mute and liquid could constitute length by 'position' in Plautus (see Introd. ii. § 30).

Adseruate istunc, sultis, serui. ego ibo, ut conueniam senem,
Dicam ut sibi penum aliud [ad]ornet, siquidem sese uti uolet;
Nam hic quidem ut adornat aut iam nihil est aut iam nihil erit.—

919. A^dse RV——G^olbo V^tconu ENIAM| ^s E^nem *A* istum *J* cōueniā *V* 920. *versum laudat Priscianus inst. V p.* 170, 19 *H.* (*testatus* penus *neutr. gen. ut vid.*) 'dicam seni curet sibi aliud penus' DICAMVTSIBIPENVMALI ^ss ADORN^etsi QVIDEMSESEVTI-VOL— *A* penum ali * * adornet *ut vid. A*: penum aliud ornet *ceteri* (*de Prisciano vid. supr.*) sese uti uolet B^3 *in spat. vac.* 921. NAMHIC̣Q V^idem- ^utador NATAVTIAMNIK^ile Sta VTIAM|NI—— *A* adnat E^1 (*corr.* E^2) nichil *EJ* nichil *EJ*

919. **Ibo, ut conueniam.** Cf. *Bacch.* 348. In *Men.* 557 the MSS. offer: *Ibo et conueniam seruum, si potero, meum* (*ut* Abraham).

920. **Dicam ut.** *Mil.* 1191 *Ego illi dicam ut me adiutorem, qui onus feram ad portum, roget*, Men. 1044 *dicam ut a me abeat liber quo uolet*, *Pers.* 281. Cf. v. 397 above. **Penum aliud.** The Neuter Gender is attested by Priscian, while the form *penum* is confirmed by the agreement of the Ambrosian Palimpsest with the other MSS. (cf. *erile penum* Afran. *Com.* 329 R.). The *adornet* apparently offered by A may be due to confusion with *adornat* of the following line. I hesitate to admit the form *alid* of Lucr. i. 263. Studemund favoured *alibi*, corresponding to *hic* in v. 921, the Adverb 'here.' Leo reads *penum alium adornet*, supposing the Neuter Gender of the word to be a grammatical fiction, due to the Early Latin fashion of writing *-e* for *-is* (but see my note on v. 518). I see no reason for doubting the testimony of the Grammarians to the variety of Gender and of Stem in the word. (See note on v. 472.) It is unfortunate that Priscian's quotation of this line should be so evidently inaccurate. **Sese uti uolet.** On the construction of Acc. with Inf. after *volo*, &c., see notes on vv. 360, 739.

921. Since the scansion *nĭhĭl est* is scarcely Plautine, the traditional text requires Hiatus after *quidem* (Introd. ii. § 40), as well as after *nam* (Introd. ii. § 41). Many editors insert a word in the first part of the line: *Nam hic* (Adv.) *quidem*, <*ille*> *ut adornat* (Niemeyer), *Nam* <*hercle*> *hic* (Pron.) *quidem ut* <*uti*> *adornat* (Schoell). But the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest suggests that, if anything has been lost, it has been lost from the end of the line, e.g. *nihil*<*i fŭ*>*erit*. (*Nihili* is over and over again changed to *nihil* in the MSS., and the change of *fuerit* to *erit* is not unknown, e.g. *Epid.* 225; but *nihili esse* is normally used of persons.)

[redacted]

HEGIO, PHILOCRATES, PHILOPOLEMVS, STALAGMVS. V. i.

HEG. Ioui disque ago gratias merito magnas,
Quom te redducem tuo patri reddiderunt

V. i. *unius versus spat. A* HEIO *B*: EGIO *J* STALACMVS *B*
vv. 922—927. *tribus versibus complectitur J* 922. IOVIDEISQ·AGOGRA^ti^AS-MERI^toma^GNAS *A* HEG. B^3: PHILOCR. *ceteri* (*om. J ut vid.*: *A n. l.*) oui *c. sp. in. VE*: Noui *J* deisque *A*: diisque *BE ex ras. J*: diisquae *VE ante ras.* ago* (*er.* s *ut vid.*) *V* gras (*sic*) *J* 923. CVMTEREDVCEMTV^opatri^-^redd^I^de^RVNT *A* Cum *AJ* redducem (*ut Reizius Rud. v.* 909) *Schneiderus de elem. ling. lat. p.* 587 *sqq.*: reducem *libri* Q. reducem tuo te *Brixius* redderunt *B* patri reddiderunt *et in v.* 925 (adhuc te c)arens dum hic fui sustentabam *suppl. m. rec. in panno adglutinato in V*

Act V. Scene i. Hegio appears on the stage by the right-hand door, having just returned from the harbour. He is accompanied by Philocrates and by Philopolemus, his son, who had been captured by the Eleans and who has been released through Philocrates' agency. Stalagmus, the slave who kidnapped Tyndarus, follows in the rear, fettered with a *boia* (v. 888). After Hegio's opening song of thanksgiving (in Bacchiac Tetrameters, the same metre as the mournful 'canticum' of Act IV. Sc. ii.), the metre is Trochaic Septenarii. The courtesy of Philopolemus in the service of his newly acquired friend, Philocrates, and the sollicitude of the latter on account of his faithful slave, are cleverly depicted. Tyndarus is finally sent for, and the two go into the house, leaving Hegio to examine Stalagmus.

922. **Ioui disque.** See note on v. 868.

923. **Redducem.** Though *redduco* is a common Early Latin form of the Verb, the form *reddux* of the Noun is open to doubt (cf. *rĕducem* v. 931). Plautus however uses it again in another Bacchiac Canticum, in the *Rudens* (v. 909):

> Quom me ex suis locis pulchre ornatum expediuit,
> Templis redducem, plurima praeda onustum.

Similarly *recclusit* (v. 918 above), *rellatum* (Ter. *Phorm.* 21 *Quod ab illo adlatumst, sibi esse rellatum putet*) are abnormal forms (Introd. ii. § 5). We have *rĕdux* in the two occurrences of the word in Terence (*Haut.* 398, *Hec.* 852), as, to all appearance, in its single occurrence in the fragments of the other Republican Dramatists (Naev. *Trag.* praet. 2 R. *Vita insepulta laetus in patriam redux*); so that many editors would banish it entirely from Plautus also. Brix points out that the Oblique Case of the Personal Pronoun normally follows the Possessive (e.g. vv. 181, 400, 853, &c.) and transposes *Quom rĕducem tuo te p. r.* And yet it is in Cantica that the normal order is most liable to be departed from, and that abnormal forms of words are most to be expected.

Quomque ex miseriis plurimis me exemerunt,
Quae adhuc te carens dum hic fui sustentabam,
Quomque hunc conspicor in potestate nostra,
  Quomque haec reperta est fides firma nobis.
PHILOP. Satis iam dolui ex animo, et cura satis me
  et lacrumis maceraui,

924. CVMQ·EXMISERIISPLVRIMISMEEXEMERVNT *A* Cumque *AJ* ex *AB*[2]: et *ceteri* miserus *V* me exemerunt *AB*[2]*J*: metemerunt *ceteri* (mei- *ut vid. B*[1]: met- *an* mei- *incert. E*) 925. QVAEADHVCC^arensdu^MHVCFVISVS^te^NTABAM *A* Que *B*[1] (*corr. B*[2]) carens dum huc (*om.* te) *ut vid. A*: te carens dum hic *ceteri* sustentebam *E* (*de V cf. ad v.* 923): sustinentabam *J* 926. CVMQ·E——NOSTRA *A* Cumque *AJ* conspicor *Geppertus*: conspicio *BJ*: conspitio *VE* (*A n. l.*) 927. CVMQ·HAECREPER——OBIS *A* Cumque *AJ* hec *J* <re> repertast *Spengelius Philol.* XXXVII *p.* 449 928. SATISIAMDOLVIEXANIMOETCVRASATISMELACRVMIS|MA—— *A* PHILOP. *om. B* (*J n. l.*) exammo (-amino?) *V*: examino *E* satis me *A*: me satis *ceteri* et *om. A* lacrimis *VJ* maceraui *Camerarius*: maceraui hoc *libri* (*A n. l.*)

925. **Quae,** in loose reference to *miseriis* (v. 924), as in *Asin.* 559 *uirtutes tuas...quae domi duellique male fecisti*, Amph. 966 *Ego rem diuinam intus faciam, uota quae sunt*, Men. 990 *ut imperium meum Sapienter habeatis curae, quae imperaui atque impero*, Ter. *Haut.* 876 *harum rerum... Quae sunt dicta.* See note on v. 898. **Carens...fui,** 'I was lacking.' The use of the Pres. Part. with the Substantive Verb in Latin is old. On the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus (*C. I. L.* i. 196) we have SENATVOSQVE SENTENTIAM VTEI SCIENTES ESETIS, 'senatusque sententiam uti scientes essetis,' as in *Poen.* 1038 *ut tu sis sciens.* Similarly *Rud.* 943 *tui sermonis sum indigens*, Poen. 660 *ille est cupiens*, Truc. 125 *Tuis... audiens sum imperiis.* **Sustentabam.** The Perfect is used in a similar sentence in Ter. *Andr.* 188 *Dum tempus ad eam rem tulit, siui*, 443 *dum licitumst ei dumque aetas tulit, Amauit.*

926. **Conspicor** takes the place of *conspicio* when the metre necessitates it (e.g. at end of line), but not otherwise. The form was therefore not much used in Plautus' time.

927. The concluding line of a Bacchiac (Cretic, &c.) passage is often catalectic or 'contracted' (see note on v. 785), so that editors have no justification in disregarding the united testimony of the Ambrosian Palimpsest and the Palatine MSS., and changing *haec* to *illaec* (with Bach), or to *huius* (with Bothe). Nor may we transpose *est repertă*, in the face of the united testimony of AP. The most probable correction, if correction were required, would be Spengel's <re> *reperta est*, for *re* might have dropped out through Haplography both in A and P.

Satis iam audiui tuas aerumnas, ad portum mihi quas memorasti.
Hoc agamus. PHILOCR. Quid nunc, quoniam tecum seruaui fidem

929. SATISIAMAVDIVITVASAERVMNAS^{adport}VMMIKIQVAS|—MORASTI *A* aerumnas *A*: erumnas *ceteri* (erumpnas *J*) apud *J* mihi *om. J* memorasti *ex* marceraui h *E* 930. KOCAGAMVS*QVIDNVN——MSERVAVIFIDĒ *A*

928. **Ex animo.** The phrase *miser ex animo* is not uncommon (*Trin.* 398, *Epid.* 526, *Stich.* 2). Some editors put the comma not after *animo*, but after *cura*, which necessitates omission of the second *et*. With the combination *ex animo et cura* may be compared *Cist.* 60 *Doleo ab animo, doleo ab oculis, doleo ab aegritudine.* (Strictly speaking *ex* in the phrase *ex animo* has not quite the same force as in the phrase *ex cura*, 'owing to anxiety'; cf. *Poen.* prol. 69 *Conicitur ipse in morbum ex aegritudine*, Cas. 361 *adsudascis iam ex metu*; see note on v. 959 below.) Seyffert proposes *me sat et*, pointing out that *satis* has been substituted for *sat* in our MSS. at *Aul.* 187, *Pers.* 839. Here however *satis* is established by the consensus of A and P. **Dolui.** In Plautus' plays we can trace the gradual development of *doleo* from an Impersonal to a Personal Verb. The normal expression is *dolet mihi* or *id* (*hoc*) *dolet mihi* (cf. v. 152): often the subject is some part of the body, e.g. *oculi dolent* Men. 882, *renes dolent* Curc. 236, *hirae dolent Curc.* 238; cf. *animus mihi dolet* Merc. 388. But there are not wanting examples of the personal use. Corresponding to *animus mihi dolet* and *oculi dolent* is the personal construction in *Cist.* 60 (quoted above): corresponding to *id* (*hoc*) *dolet mihi* are the phrases, *Stich.* 34 *an id doles?* (AP), *Trin.* 288 *haec ego doleo.* Similarly we find *totus doleo* Aul. 410, *Stich.* 749, and *ni doleres tu, ego dolerem* Pseud. 1320.

930. **Hoc agamus.** Cf. ad v. 444. It is perhaps from the beginning of this line that the intrusive *hoc* at the end of v. 928 in the MSS. (*maceraui hoc*) has come. The scribe of some archetype had nearly omitted v. 929, owing to Homoeoarchon (*Satis*). **Quid nunc?** This normally forms a phrase by itself, without the addition of any other word, e.g. *Truc.* prol. 4 *Quid nunc? daturin estis an non?*, Aul. 255 *Quid nunc? etiam mihi despondes filiam?*, Bacch. 1167 *Quid nunc? etiam redditis nobis Filios et seruom?*, *Pseud.* 155 *Quid nunc? doletne?*, &c. In *Asin.* 711 the phrase is followed by a clause with *quoniam*, as here, though the exact form of the line is somewhat uncertain:

Quid nunc? amabo, quoniam, ut est libitum, nos delusistis,
Datisne argentum? (*quoniam amabo* MSS.; *q. ambo* edd.)

Tibique hunc reducem in libertatem feci? HEG. Fecisti ut tibi,
Philocrates, numquam referre gratiam possim satis,
Proinde ut tu promeritu's de me et filio. PHILOP. Immo potes,
Pater, et poteris et ego potero, et di eam potestatem dabunt
Vt beneficium bene merenti nostro merito muneres;
Sicut tu huic potes, pater mi, facere merito maxume.

---

931. TIBIQ·KVNCREDVCEM—— *A* 932—1007. *deest A* 933. PHILOCR. *J* potest J^1 (*corr.* J^2 *ut vid.*) 934. dii *J* 935. benefitium *E* bene meriti *VEJ* muneres *ex* muneris *J* munerem *Gertzius* 936. me *ante* merito *eras. in fine v. V* maxime *VE*

The reading *qui nunc* (*Pseud.* 155 P, *Epid.* 517 A, *Amph.* 755) is possibly due to an old fashion of spelling *quinnunc*, as *etiannum* for *etiamnum*, &c.

932. *Most.* 214 *Numquam ego illi possum gratiam referre ut meritust de me*, Pacuv. *Trag.* 153 R.:

ut, si ita sunt promerita uestra, aequiperare ut queam
Vereor! nisi numquam fatiscar facere quod quibo boni.

933. **Proinde** (see note on v. 314) is the form used by Plautus before a vowel (e.g. vv. 292, 307, 314), *proin* the pronunciation before a consonant (e.g. vv. 63, 551, 855, 865). The old distinction of *proin* in commands, *proinde* in comparisons, is wrong. We have *proinde* in commands when followed by an initial vowel, e.g. *Asin.* 27 *proinde actutum...eloquere.*

935. **Muneres.** The verb recurs in the *Miles*, vv. 691, 695, 715 (cf. *Rud.* 418), always governing the Acc. of the Person with or without the Abl. of the recompense. Here the person (*bene merenti nostro*) is in the Ethical Dative, and his action (*beneficium*) is governed in the Acc. by *munero.*

936. **Sicut tu huic.** *Sicut* introduces the particular instance in which the general rule *beneficium bene merenti nostro munerare* may be put in operation. It is from this use of the word that the sense of 'since,' 'inasmuch as,' has arisen, e.g. *Epid.* 272 *Nunc occasiost faciundi, prius quam in urbem aduenerit, Sicut cras hic aderit*, Mil. 974 *Quin tu illam iube abs te abire quo lubet: sicut soror Eius huc gemina uenit Ephesum et mater, accersuntque eam.* I see no reason for changing the reading of the MSS. to *sicut nunc*, as Leo does. **Pater mi.** Similarly *Bacch.* 739, *Trin.* 1180, always with the ictus *patér mi.* The normal order is *mí pater* (see note on v. 1021).

HEG. Quid opust uerbis? lingua nullast qua negem quicquid roges.
PHILOCR. Postulo abs te ut mi illum reddas seruom, quem hic reliqueram
Pignus pro me, qui mihi melior quam sibi semper fuit,
Pro bene factis eius ut ei pretium possim reddere.
HEG. Quod bene fecisti referetur gratia id quod postulas;

---

937. opus *VEJ* nullast *ex* nullae *B*: nulla est *VEJ* 938. *post* te *ras.* 2 *litt. in J* mihi *libri* (michi *J*) *post hunc versum sequitur v.* 941 *in libris* (*praeter J*) 939. michi *J* 940. ut ei *ς*: uti *libri* precium *B*: praetium *J* 941. (*cf. ad v.* 938) HEG. *om. libri* (*cf. ad v.* 942) (*J n. l.*) secisti *ex* sicisti *E* refetur *V*: refertur *EJ* *ante* id 3—4 *litt. sp. VE* aequom p. *Schoellius*

---

938. **Postulo abs te ut.** This is the only passage in Plautus in which *postulo* is followed (1) by *ut*, except *Aul.* 318 *Infit ibi postulare plorans, eiulans, Ut sibi liceret miluom uadarier*, (2) by *ab aliquo*, except *Pers.* 41 *nam tu aquam a pumici nunc postulas.* It normally takes Acc. of thing, or Acc. and Inf., or Inf. alone (see note on v. 739). We have a parallel to this line in Caecil. *Com.* 139 R. *hoc a te postulo Ne cum meo gnato posthac limassis caput.* **Reliqueram,** sc. 'before I went away.' (See note on v. 17.) So *Rud.* 554 *nunc si me adulescens Plesidippus uiderit, Quo ab arrabonem pro Palaestra acceperam* (sc. 'before starting'), *Most.* 547 *Conueni illum, unde hasce aedis emeram*, &c.

940. **Ei,** Spondee or Iambus. The contrast of the Gen. and Dat. cases brings the Pronoun into prominence (see Introd. ii. § 15).

941. **Quod bene fecisti.** The relative clause is the equivalent of the Noun *beneficium*, as in vv. 961, 966, &c. This line in the MSS. follows v. 938, the intervening lines (vv. 939, 940) having apparently been omitted by some scribe who did not become conscious of his error till too late to put them in their proper place. It is true that there is no apparent cause (such as Homoeoteleuton or the like) for the error, but it is scarcely possible that v. 941 was really interjected by Hegio in the middle of Philocrates' statement. **Gratia** can hardly be anything else than Nom.; for *gratiam referre* is a current phrase, while *referre aliquid gratiā* is an expression unknown to Plautus. *Id quod postulas* seems to stand in apposition to *gratia*, a looseness of diction that is found (though in a different form) in *Asin.* 576 *Num male relata est gratia, ut collegam collau-*

Et id et aliud, quod me orabis, impetrabis. atque te
Nolim suscensere quod ego iratus ei feci male.
PHILOCR. Quid fecisti? HEG. In lapicidinas conpeditum condidi,
Vbi resciui mihi data esse uerba. PHILOCR. Vae misero mihi,
Propter meum caput labores homini euenisse optumo!
HEG. At ob eam rem mihi libellam pro eo argenti ne duis:
Gratiis a me, ut sit liber, ducito. PHILOCR. Edepol, Hegio,
Facis benigne: sed quaeso, hominem ut iubeas arcessi. HEG. Licet.
Vbi estis uos? ite actutum, Tyndarum huc accersite.

---

942. HEG. *praem. libri* (*cf. ad v.* 941) (*J n. l.*) impetrabis (tra *ex corr.*) *B* atque] et *J* 943. succensere *J* *ante* ei 2 *litt. ras. B* male *ex* mali *B*: malae *E* 944. lapidicinas B^1 (*corr.* B^3) compeditum *J* 945. michi *J* ue *libri* 946. capud *E* 947. libella *VE* ne *ras. ex* me *V* dius *VE ut vid.* 948. Gratiis *Bothius*: Cratis *libri* (Gratis *J*) ducito *Lindemannus*: aducito *libri* (adducito *J*) hedepol *E* egio *J* 949. queso *BVJ* accersi *J* 950. <agite> ite *Leo*: uos <heus> *Skutschius* tyndarum *ex* tydarum *B*: tindarum *E* accersite (*ex* ar-) *V*: arcoersite *E*

---

daui. Brix prefers to make *id* Object to *impetrabis* and punctuates the sentence thus: *ref. gratia. id quod postulas, Et id et aliud,* &c.

942. **Orabis.** The sense 'I ask' is the normal sense of *oro* in Plautus, though a trace of the older sense 'I speak' (from *os*, the mouth) is seen in expressions like *aequom, ius orat.* (For particulars see Heerdegen, *Lat. Semasiologie*, pp. 8 sqq.)

946. **Euenisse.** The Inf. of Exclamation is here preceded by an Interjectional phrase, *uae misero mihi. Epid.* 521 is a doubtful parallel in Plautus, but we have in Terence, e.g. *Haut.* 503 *di uostram fidem, Ita conparatum esse hominum naturam omnium!*, 630 *O Iuppiter, tantam esse in animo inscitiam!*, &c. Terence affects the Infinitive of Exclamation much more than Plautus.

947. **Libellam...argenti.** *Pseud.* 629 *Tibi libellam argenti numquam credam.* **Duis** (cf. 331). On these so-called 'Subjunctives' in *-im*, which really are the relics in Latin of the Optative Mood, cf. ad v. 728.

949. **Licet,** "'I will certainly.' So *Pseud.* 357, *Men.* 158, 213, *Rud.* 1211—1226; but never 'yes,' in answer to a question." Morris.

[redacted]

Vos ite intro : interibi ego ex hac statua uerberea uolo
Erogitare, meo minore quid sit factum filio.
Vos lauate interibi. PHILOP. Sequere hac, Philocrates, me intro.—PHILOCR. Sequor.—

---

951. interibi ς: inter ibo *libri* exac *V* ueruerea B^3: **ruerea B^1: ueruercea *V.*: ueruecea *ex* uercea *E*: ueruecea *J* 952. quod *E* (*vix* quid E^1, quod E^3) 953. Phylocr. (*sic*) Sequere hac phylocr. (*sic*) me intro phylocrates sequor *J*

---

950. Leo suggests the insertion of *agite* to help the metre of the line, supposing the word to have dropped out (through Homoeoteleuton) before *ite*. The phrase *agite ite* certainly occurs in *Mil.* 1351 *agite ite cum dis beneuolentibus* (*agite tecum* B), *Stich.* 683 *Agite ite foras*. Niemeyer adds *serui* after *estis* in imitation of *Cist.* 649 *Ubi éstis, serui? occlúdite aedis péssulis, repágulis.* Schoell prints *Heús, ubi éstis* (inserting *Heus* and omitting *uos*) on the model of v. 830; others *Heus ubi estis uos* on the strength of *Pseud.* 1137 A. *Heús ubi éstis uos?* B. *Heús adulescens, quíd istic debetúr tibi?* (Neither the reading of this line nor the scansion of the preceding: A. *Heús ubi estis uos?* B. *Hic quidem ad me récta habet rectám uiam*, is wholly free from doubt.) The loss of *heus* would be more easily accounted for, if it stood after *uos*. Langen approves of the transposition *Ubi uos estis?*, comparing *Truc.* 896 *Quíd hic uos ágitis?*, although, as we have seen, the form of the phrase used elsewhere by Plautus seems to be *ubi estis uos* (*Pseud.* 1136, 1137) or *ubi estis* (v. 830, *Cist.* 649, *Rud.* 512, 657). The reading of the MSS. requires the scansion of *ubi* in Prosodic Hiatus.

951. **Statua uerberea.** *Pseud.* 911 *Sed eccum uideo uerberaem statuam uti*; "in *Pseud.* 911 of a slave who shows no fear of punishment. The adjective has the form which denotes material (cf. *ligneus*, *aureus*), and the figure implied in the phrase 'statue made of blows' seems to be the same as *Asin.* 363 *interminatust nos futuros ulmeos*, 'beaten until we turn into rods.'" Morris.

952. **Minore...filio.** See note on v. 762. **Quid sit factum filio,** "'what has become of my son.' So *Most.* 636 *quid eost argento factum?*, *Trin.* 594 *quid ea re fuat*, *Most.* 231, *Mil.* 299, 973, *Pseud.* 88, 779, *Truc.* 799, all in *quid*-clauses, direct or indirect; twice (*Poen.* 1085, *Trin.* 157) after *si quid*. To be distinguished from the dative with *fieri*." Morris.

Act V. Scene ii. (Trochaic Septenarii). Hegio elicits from the surly, impenitent Stalagmus the information that the kidnapped boy had been sold to Philocrates' father. He calls Philocrates out from the house.

In this Scene there is no change of Metre, nor do new characters appear on the stage (cf. *Pseud.* II. iii.). It is possible that the original Scene-heading contained the word RESTITERVNT (see on Act IV. Sc. iii.).

HEGIO senex, STALAGMVS seruus fugitiuus. V. ii.

HEG. Age tu illuc procede, bone uir, lepidum mancupium meum.

STAL. Quid me oportet facere, ubi tu talis uir falsum autumas?

Fui ego bellus, lepidus: bonus uir numquam, neque frugi bonae,

Neque ero <n>umquam; ne spem ponas me bonae frugi fore.

V. ii. SENEX SERVVS FVGITIVVS (*om.* HEGIO *et* STALAGMVS) *libri* (EGIO SENEX STALAGMVS SERVVS FVGITIVVS *J*)
954. HEG. *om. VEJ* ge *c. sp. init. VE* mancipium *VEJ*
955. STAL. *om. VE* Quod *E* 956. bone *B* 957. umquam (umqua *V*) *libri*: *corr. Vahlenus Herm.* XVII 602 ne *B*: neque *ceteri* ne <in> spem *Guietus* bone *BE* (*J n. l.*)

---

954. **Bone uir,** Gk. ὠγαθέ, ironical. Cf. *Poen.* 1332, Ter. *Ad.* 556, &c.

955. **Me,** being emphatic, is probably not elided (Introd. ii. § 40), so that the first foot will be a dactyl *Quid mĕ op-*.

956. **Frugi bonae.** *Frux* in the Singular had this metaphorical sense in various old phrases, e.g. *Pseud.* 468 *tamen ero frugi bonae*, Poen. 892 *erus si tuos uolt facere frugem*, Trin. 118 *quin ad frugem conrigis?*, 270 *Certa res est ad frugem adplicare animum*, but most frequently in the predicative or attributive use of the Dat., *homo frugi* or *homo frugi est.* Hence the later survival of *frugi* as an Adjective.

957. The reading of the line is very doubtful. The *ero umquam* of the MSS. with Prosodic Hiatus after *ero* (Introd. ii. § 40) might almost be allowed to stand, were it not for the frequency with which the Early Latin doubling of the Negative has been altered in our MSS. (e.g. *Pseud.* 136 *neque...numquam* A, *neque...umquam* P, *Men.* 1027 *Nec...numquam* B, *Nec...umquam* CD). But a difficulty remains in *ne* (B: *neque* VEJ) *spem ponas*, which, as Hallidie remarks, ought to mean '(and) do not abandon the hope' (cf. *pallium ponere*, &c.). Guietus proposed *ne in spem ponas.* One is tempted to adopt a former conjecture of Brix and to suppose that *sum* (written in early minuscule *s*, with a horizontal line above) has dropped out before *spem*, so that the line will run:

Neque ero umquam neque <sum>: spem ponas me bonae frugi fore.

This involves the preference of *neque* of the inferior MSS. to the *ne* of B.

HEG. Propemodum ubi loci fortunae tuae sint facile intellegis.
Si eris uerax, tua ex re facies—ex mala meliusculam.
Recte et uera loquere: sed neque <tu> uere neque recte adhuc

958. HEG. *om.* *VE* fortune *B*: furtunae *VJ* 959. *verba* ex mala meliusculam *Stalagmo dat Schoellius* 960. Recta *B* set *E* <tu> *Pylades*

958. **Propemodum,** to judge from its Plautine use, has much the same sense as *facile.* For the repetition cf. e.g. *Merc.* 67 *extemplo—confestim.*

959. **Tua ex re facies—ex mala meliusculam.** The last words seem to be added as an afterthought and are not quite in keeping with *tua ex re facies*, 'you will benefit yourself' (e.g. *Men.* 661 *ex re tua feceris*). They would naturally have as a preliminary *tuam rem*, 'you will put your affairs out of a bad into a slightly better condition.' The Preposition *ex* has a slightly different sense in the two parts of the sentence (cf. ad v. 928). Leo punctuates after *re*:

Si eris uerax, tua ex re, facies ex mala meliusculam,

leaving *facies* to be supplied in the first phrase. The words *ex mala meliusculam* have been with much likelihood assigned to Stalagmus. In that case they will be the incentive to Hegio's rejoinder *recte et uera loquere* (Ind.), which, as the passage is printed in this edition, is a command (*loquere* Imper.). Brix boldly transfers vv. 958—9 to the place of v. 968, so that v. 960 follows immediately on vv. 955—7.

960. **Recte et uera.** Ter. *Ad.* 609 *Et recte et uerum dicis.* For the combination of Adverb and Adjective in colloquial Latin cf. v. 271, *Trin.* 268 *Sunt tamen quos miseros maleque habeas*, *Pseud.* 110, *Asin.* 567 sq. The defective metre is easily remedied by the insertion of the pronoun *tu*, which should be joined immediately to the Negative, for *neque ego*, *neque tu* (sometimes with the intervention of *hercle*, *edepol*, &c.) is the normal arrangement in Plautus, e.g. *Men.* 960 *Neque ego insanio neque pugnas neque ego litis coepio* (for other examples see Kaempf, *de Pronominum Personalium Usu et Collocatione*, Berl. 1886, p. 41). *Tu* would more easily drop out before *u* of *uere* than before *recte.* Besides, the ictus will fall on *tu* in this position in the line, and that suits the emphasis which would attach to the Pronoun in this sentence. Schoell places *tu* after the second *neque* and before *recte.*

Fecisti umquam. STAL. Quod ego fatear, credin pudeat cum autumes?
HEG. At ego faciam ut pudeat, nam in ruborem te totum dabo.
STAL. Eia, credo ego imperito plagas minitaris mihi.
Tandem istaec aufer, dic quid fers, ut feras hinc quod petis.

961. STAL. *om.* (6 *l. sp.*) *VE* quid *J* fatear (r *ex* t) *E* 962. ruborem *ς*: rumorem *B*: roborem *VEJ* 963. plagas *add.* *J*[2] michi *EJ* 964. HEG. *praem.* *VEJ* (*cf. ad v.* 965) ista *libri*: *corr.* *Schmidtius de pron. dem. p.* 79 quid *corr. ex* qui id *ut vid.* *B*

961. **Fatear,** Subj. by attraction to *pudeat.* See note on v. 237.

962. **In ruborem...dabo.** *Asin.* 426 *Iussin in splendorem dari bullas has foribus nostris?*, Pseud. 928 *in timorem dabo militarem aduenam*, Asin. 574 *Ubi saepe ad languorem tua duritia dederis octo Validos lictores*, Ter. *Haut.* 807 *uel me haec deambulatio, Quam non laboriosa, ad languorem dedit.* In a fragment of the Comedian Anaxandrides (22 K.) we have a similar threat (apparently of a master to a slave): Ἐρυθρότερον καρῖδος ὀπτῆς σ' ἀποφανῶ.

964. **Tandem,** often in impatient commands, e.g. *Mil.* 1030 *tandem ades, remeligo.* **Istaec aufer.** *Curc.* 245 *aufer istaec, quaeso, atque hoc responde quod rogo*, with that colloquial use of *aufer* found in Hor. *S.* II. vii. 43 *aufer me vultu terrere*, Aul. 638 *aufer cauillam*, Truc. 861 *aufer nugas.* The change of *dic* of the MSS. into the older form *dice* would restore the metre of the line, but *dice* seems not to be used before an initial consonant by Plautus unless there is something of a pause after the word, e.g. *Rud.* 124 A. *Tu siquid opus est, dice.* B. *Dic quod te rogo*, *Mil.* 256 *dice, monstra, praecipe* (cf. ad v. 359). On the other hand the form *ista* calls for change. The rarity of the forms *ista* Nom., Acc. Plur. Neut., *istud* Nom., Acc. Sing. Neut. in Plautus and Terence has long excited the suspicion of editors. In Terence there is not a single occurrence of the Nom., Acc. Sing. Neut. of *iste* in which the form *istuc* is not attested by at least the greater portion of the MSS., and the same is true of the Nom. Acc. Plur. form *istaec*, with the single exception of *Adel.* 677 *Quoi uéneram aduocatus, sed quid ista, Aeschine, Nostra?*, where the chief MS., the Bembinus, reads *istic.* The form *istud* is printed by editors in *Andr.* 941 A. *Cum tua religione, odium—nodum in scirpo quaeris.* B. *Quid istud est?*, where all the MSS. shew *istuc*, and *ista* in *Adel.* 185 A. *Egon debacchatus sum autem an tu in me?* B. *Mitte ista atque ad rem redi*, although the corrector of the Bembinus has changed *ista* (the reading of the first hand,

as of the other MSS.) into *istaec*. If we examine the evidence in Plautus for the two doubtful forms, we cannot fail to be struck with its inconclusiveness. The scribes of our MSS. shew themselves so ready to change archaic into more familiar forms (e.g. *isti* Adv. into *istic*; see note on v. 60), that it is only surprising that their evidence for *istud*, *ista* is not stronger. In no passage where the testimony of the Ambrosian Palimpsest is available, do we find these forms. Their occurrences are all in portions of the text for which we have the evidence of the Palatine MSS. alone, and even so, there is not a single one from that portion where the Palatine evidence is at its best (*Persa-Trin.*). Here are the instances where the MSS. (i.e. the Palatine MSS. in the absence of A) agree in the reading *istud* (in *Asin.* 308 *istuc* DEJ, in *Asin.* 827 *istuc* D, *istac* J, in *Aul.* 418 *istuc* D):

Asin. 644 Proinde ístud facias ípse, quod faciámus nobis suádes.

Aul. 490 Dotátae, si istud iús pauperibus pónitur (*dotata es istud uis* MSS.).

Capt. 898 *A.* Únde id? *B.* A me meóque gnato. *A.* Spónden tu istud? *B.* Spóndeo (*sponde tu i.* MSS.).

Cas. 375 Optumum atque aequíssumum istud ésse iure iúdico.

Cist. 20 *A.* Amábo, hicine ístud decét? *B.* Iusque fásque est.

27 Si idem istud nos faciamus, si idem imitemur, ita tamen uix uiuimus.

75 *A.* Véniet. *B.* Spissum istúc amanti est uérbum 'ueniet' nísi uenit (*istud* MSS., A n. l.).

106 Quámquam istud mihi erít molestum tríduum et damnúm dabis (*istud mihi* B, *mihi istud* VEJ).

(*Most.* 979 *A.* Néque istud aiio. *B.* Ei pérdis. *A.* Immo súum patrem illic pérdidit) (*illud* B, *istud* CD, A n. l.)

In one of these passages (*Cist.* 75) the form *istuc* is required, in none of them is it forbidden, by the metre.

Here are the instances for *ista*:—

Amph. 589 Quoíus ego hodie in térgum faxo ista éxpetant mendácia (*istaec faxo* Schmidt).

Asin. 578 *A.* Iam omítte ista atque hoc quód rogo respónde. *B.* Rogita quód uis (post *ista* ras. 2 litt. in J, *istaec hoc* Schmidt).

860 Pól ni uera ista éssent, numquam fáceret ea quae núnc facit (*uera ista* DEJ, *ista uera* B, *istaec uera* Schmidt).

Capt. 414 Féci ego ista ut comménoras, et te méminisse id gratum ést mihi (*ita* Schmidt).

964 (the line under discussion).

Cas. 208 *A.* Satin sána's? nam tu quidem áduorsus tuam istaéc rem loquere. *B.* Insípiens (*ista* B, *istam* EJ).

HEG. Satis facundu's. sed iam fieri dictis uolo conpendium.

965. HEG. *om. VEJ* (*cf. ad v.* 964): *add. B*[3] facundus *ex* faciundus *ras. E* *post* iam 5 *litt. ras. B* conpendium (comp- *BVJ*) uolo *libri*: *corr. Bothius* dicta conpendi uolo *Guietus*

Most. 1134 *A.* Áge mitte ista ac tu ád me ad cenam—*B.* Díc uenturum; quíd taces? (*acto* MSS., *istaec*, *te* Ritschl, fort. *istaec*, *tu*).

In one of these passages (*Cas.* 208) the form *istaec* is required by the metre; in another (the line under discussion) either the form *istaec* or some change of the reading of the MSS. is required; in two (*Asin.* 860 and 578) the change of *ista* to *istaec* is supported by the traditional text, and in the remaining three the removal of the doubtful form is effected without violence to the MSS. (e.g. in *Amph.* 589 the loss of *-ec* before *ex-* of *expetant* is very natural).

On 'à priori' grounds there is no objection to the forms *istud* and *ista*. Since *illud* is in use along with *illuc*, *illa* along with *illaec*, we should be prepared to accept *istud* and *ista* as at least occasional by-forms, if the evidence of the MSS. were sufficient. That evidence however, if carefully examined, seems to me to pronounce so strongly against these forms, that we are driven to the conclusion that by some caprice of language, *istud* and *ista* were not admitted to the diction of Plautus and Terence. Leo retains *ista* in this line and adds *ac* before *dic*. But the besetting sin of scribes was rather the effacing of the Early Latin Asyndeton in such cases (see note on v. 658). Both *aufer* (&c.) *dic* (&c.) (e.g. *Poen.* 1035 *Maledicta hinc aufer, linguam compescas face*) and *aufer* (&c.) *ac dic* (&c.) (e.g. *Cist.* 747 *Sed quaeso ambages, mulier, mitte atque hoc age*) were permissible expressions in Plautus (see note on v. 540). A corruption in a MS. would take the form of the insertion of *atque* or *ac* rather than of the omission of the copula. Indeed so frequent is this insertion as to suggest a certain amount of doubt about any line where the copula is not required by the metre. Hence *Curc.* 245 (quoted above) is not so satisfactory evidence of the use of the copula as *Cist.* 747, and the removal of the copula in *Asin.* 578, *Most.* 1134 is a method of emendation to which exception cannot be taken.

965. **Dictis uolo conpendium.** This reading involves the least possible departure from the MSS., which offer *dictis c. uolo.* Since the usual construction in Plautus is *aliquid compendi facere* (*Asin.* 307, *Bacch.* 183, *Most.* 60, *Pers.* 471, *Poen.* 351, *Pseud.* 1141, *Truc.* 376), most editors rewrite the phrase in this form, *dicta conpendi uolo.* But we have other instances in Plautus of departure from the normal form of the phrase:

STAL. Vt uis fiat. HEG. Bene morigerus fuit puer; nunc non decet.
Hoc agamus, iam animum aduorte ac mihi quae dicam edissere.
Si eris uerax, e tuis rebus feceris meliusculas.
STAL. Nugae istaec sunt. non me censes scire quid dignus siem?
HEG. At ea subterfugere potis es pauca, si non omnia.

---

966. STAL. *om. E* 967. aduerte *J* ac *Camerarius*: haec *libri* (hec *J*) quem *J* 968. *versum secl. Schoellius* e *manu Camerarii in B*: *om. libri* 969. Nuge *libri* (*corr. J*) ista haec *V*: ista aec *E*: istec *J* sunt *om. E* 970. subterfugere (sub *e corr.*) *B* potisses *libri* (*corr. ras. in E*, *corr. J*)

Pseud. 605 *Quisquis es, conpendium ego te facere pultandi uolo*, Rud. 179 *Errationis fecerit compendium*, Stich. 194 *ut faciam praeconis conpendium*, Cas. 517 *id ponito ad compendium*, Mil. 781 *Quam potis, tam uerba confer maxume ad conpendium*, Bacch. 161 *Conpendium edepol haut aetati optabile Fecisti, quom istanc nactu's inpudentiam.* And it is difficult to believe that the normal type, which has been reproduced with fidelity by the scribes in every other instance of its occurrence in Plautus, should in this line alone have suffered at their hands. On the other hand transposition of words is one of the commonest errors of the scribes of our MSS. of Plautus.

966. Cf. v. 867. **Bene morigerus.** So *male morigerus* in *Curc.* 169, *Epid.* 607, *Pseud.* 208. The full form *-rus* (older *-ros*) of the Nom. Sing. of the Second Declension after a short vowel seems to be retained normally by words whose *r* has come from an original *s*, e.g. *numerus* (cf. *Numisius*). The verb *gero* had originally *s* for *r* (cf. *ges-tum*). Later *-gerus* was brought into line with the majority of *ro*-Stems and became *-ger*.

967. **Hoc agamus.** Cf. ad v. 444.

968, a repetition in slightly altered form of v. 959. Editors, who object to repetitions of the kind in the Comedies of Plautus, bracket the line. To me it seems natural that Hegio should repeat his admonition.

969. **Nugae istaec sunt.** *Cas.* 333 *Nugae sunt istae magnae*, *Pseud.* 238 *Nugae istaec sunt* (cf. *Rud.* 752). So in Ter. *Phorm.* 517 *Vérba istaec sunt.* **Quid dignus siem.** Cf. *Pseud.* 937 *quantum dignu's, tantum dent*, Ter. *Phorm.* 519 *di tibi omnes id quod es dignus duint.* *Asin.* 149 (see note on v. 267) has not this construction.

STAL. Pauca effugiam, scio; nam multa euenient, et merito meo,
Quia et fugi et tibi subripui filium et eum uendidi.
HEG. Cui homini? STAL. Theodoromedi in Alide Polyplusio,
Sex minis. HEG. Pro di inmortalis, is quidem huius est pater.
Philocrates! STAL. Quin melius noui quam te et uidi saepius.
HEG. Serua, Iuppiter supreme, et me et meum gnatum mihi.
Philocrates, per tuum te genium obsecro, exi, te uolo!

---

971. *post v.* 973 *in libris*: *corr. Valla* STAL. *om. libri* (*cf. ad v.* 972) efficiam *VJ*: effitiam *E* 972. STAL. *praem. libri* (*cf. ad v.* 971) ecfugi *Schoellius* surripui *BVJ* 973. theodoro (teo- *J*) medico *libri*: *corr.* ς poliplusio *libri* (poliphrusio *J*) 974. dii *J* immortales *BJ*: immortalis *V* 975. Philocratis *B*: Philocrati *Fleckeisenus ep. cr. p.* XXIII nolii *V*: nolu *E* tu *Weilius Annal. phil. t.* LXXXIX (*a.* 1864) *p.* 49 sepius *libri* 976. suppreme *BV*: suppraeme *E*: supraeme *J* et *alt. om. VE* michi *E* 977. te *pri. om. VEJ* genium ς: ingenium *libri* exi te *ex* te exi *E*

---

971. The transposition of this line in the MSS., where it appears after v. 973, is apparently due to its having been temporarily passed over by some scribe, who was misled either through the Homoeoteleuton (v. 970 *omnia*, 971 *-o meo*) or the Homoeoarchon (v. 971 *Pauca ecfugiam*, 972 *Quia et fugi*).

974. Notice the brevity of the surly slave's reply. **Huius.** See note on v. 7.

975. **Philocrates.** To change *Philocrates* Voc. to *Philocrati* Gen. (with removal of the punctuation after *pater*) rather spoils than improves the passage. Nor is there much to be gained by changing *te* to *tu*.

976. **Serua, Iuppiter supreme.** See note on v. 768.

977. **Per tuum te genium.** The separation of *per* from its Accusative is normal in these adjurations in Plautus, e.g. *Men.* 990 *per ego uobis deos atque homines dico*, Poen. 1387 *per ego te tua genua obsecro*, Rud. 627 *per ego haec genua te obtestor*, Bacch. 905 *per te, ere, obsecro Deos inmortales* (so in Terence *Andr.* 538, 834). But it was not invariable (e.g. *Capt.* 727, *Amph.* 923, *Trin.* 520), though the curious inversions of the natural order

[redacted]

PHILOCRATES, HEGIO, STALAGMVS. V. iii.

PHILOCR. Hegio, assum. si quid me uis, impera. HEG. Hic gnatum meum
Tuo patri ait se uendidisse sex minis in Alide.
PHILOCR. Quam diu id factum est? STAL. Hic annus incipit uicensimus.
PHILOCR. Falsa memorat. STAL. Aut ego aut tu. nam tibi quadrimulum
Tuus pater peculiarem paruulum puero dedit.

V. iii. PHYLOCRATES *B* (=*B*[3]) *J* HEIO *B* (=*B*[3]): EGIO *J* 978. gio *c. sp. in. VE*: Egio *J* adsum *J* 980. Quandiu *J* uigesimus *ut vid. J* 981. *pers. om. E* 982. peoculiarem *J* paruulo *Lindemannus ex cod.* puero *ex* puerum *V*

---

that were affected in these phrases have led to transpositions in MSS. (cf. Ter. *Andr.* 289). Passages like Hor. *Epp.* I. vii. 94 *Quod te per genium dextramque deosque penates Obsecro*, Tibull. IV. v. 7 *per te dulcissima furta Perque tuos oculos per geniumque rogo*, shew us that *ingenium* of the MSS. both here and in Ter. *Andr.* 289 should be changed to *genium* (cf. critical note on v. 290). *Per* has the ictus in metre, and by inference the accent in pronunciation, when it precedes the enclitics *ego* or *te*. So we should not transpose *per te tuum* here.

Act V. Scene iii. (Trochaic Septenarii). Philocrates comes out of the house at Hegio's call; and a brief colloquy with Stalagmus leads to the ἀναγνώρισις of Tyndarus.

978. **Assum.** That this spelling (here preserved by MSS.) was also the pronunciation in vogue in Plautus' time we see from the pun in *Poen.* 279 A. *Milphio, heus ubi tu es?* B. *Assum apud te eccum.* B. *At ego elixus sis uolo.* **Si quid me uis.** For the double Accusative with *volo* cf. v. 618, *Asin.* 88, 109, *Cist.* 117, 119, *Epid.* 512 etc.

980. **Quam diu id factum est?** So *quam dudum* in *Amph.* 692 *Quam dudum istuc factum est?*, Asin. 449 *quam dudum tu aduenisti?*

981. **Falsa memorat.** *Pseud.* 1154 *uera memoras*, Cist. 668 *Non ecastor falsa memoro*, Curc. 642 *si uera memoras*, Most. 370 *si tu uera memoras*, 963 *si haec hic uera memorat.* On Plautus' predilection for this verb cf. note on v. 416.

982. Cf. 1013. **Paruulum** of the MSS. seems redundant after *quadrimulum* (v. 981), and the change to *paruulo* is very easy (cf. ad v. 176).

PHILOCR. Quid erat ei nomen? si uera dicis, memoradum mihi.
STAL. Paegnium uocitatust; post uos indidistis Tyndaro.
PHILOCR. Cur ego te non noui? STAL. Quia mos est obliuisci hominibus
Neque nouisse cuius nihili sit faciunda gratia.
PHILOCR. Dic mihi, isne istic fuit, quem uendidisti meo patri,
Qui mihi peculiaris datus est? STAL. Huius filius.
HEG. Viuitne is homo? STAL. Argentum accepi, nihil curaui ceterum.

---

983. Quod *EJ* memorandum *J* michi *EJ* 984. Peonium *libri* (Pecinium *ut vid. J*) uocitatus est *libri* tindaro *E* 986. nihil *libri* (nichil *EJ*): *corr.* ς fatiunda *VE* 987. *pers. om. E* michi *J* isti *V* 988. Qui *ras. ex* Quis *E* michi *E* peculiarias *J* STAL. *Brunckius duce Acidalio Div. p.* 101 *sq.*: *om. libri* huius *ex* huis *E* 989. HEG. *om. E* accipe *VE* nichil *EJ* caeterum *EJ*

---

983. **Quid erat ei nomen?** The form *quid* is very well established in this phrase of Plautus by the consensus of the MSS. in lines like *Pseud.* 636, 653 *Sed quid est tibi nomen?* (AP), 977 *Quid* (AP) *est ei homini nomen?*, *Trin.* 889 *Quid est tibi nomen, adulescens?*. **Memoradum mihi.** *Poen.* 1063 *memoradŭm mihi.* Without the Particle, v. 270 *memoră mihi*, Aul. 321 *memoră mihi.* (See note on v. 416.)

986. **Nouisse.** In Plautus *nouisse*, *nouissem*, *nouisti*, *nouistis* are normal, in Terence *nosse*, *nossem*, *nosti*, *nostis*. Examples of *nosti* in Plautus are *Curc.* 423, *Men.* 294 (cf. *Pers.* 700); and this form should apparently be substituted for *nouisti* of the MSS. (i.e. the Palatine MSS.) in *Aul.* 171, *Truc.* 595, 726. The examples of *nosse(m)* are less certain, but I see no reason for doubting this reading of the MSS. (i.e. the Palatine MSS.) in *Trin.* 789, 957, as well as in two lines of prologues, *Amph.* prol. 142, *Men.* prol. 20; for one would expect to find in the Palatine MSS. the substitution of *nouisse(m)* for *nosse(m)* (e.g. *Asin.* 348) rather than of *nosse(m)* for *nouisse(m)*. **Gratia,** 'influence,' as in v. 280.

987. **Istic,** 'the person you mention.'

989. **Nihil,** as in *nil moror.* **Ceterum** is Object of *curaui*, as in *Men.* 224 *ceterum cura*, Cas. 94 *dehinc conicito ceterum* (cf. Ter. *Phorm.* 166 *tu conicito cetera*), &c.

[redacted]

HEG. Quid tu ais? PHILOCR. Quin istic ipsust Tyndarus tuus filius,
Ut quidem hic argumenta loquitur. nam is mecum a puero puer
Bene pudiceque educatust usque ad adulescentiam.
HEG. Et miser sum et fortunatus, si <uos> uera dicitis;
Eo miser sum quia male illi feci, si gnatus meust.

---

990. HEG. *om. E* istuc *J* ipsus est *V*: ipsius est *J* tindarus *VE* 992. pudice quae *VE* educatus est *libri* ad *om. J* adolescentiam *J* 993 HEG. *om. BE*[1] (*add. E*[2]) fortunatis *VE*: fortunatus (o *ex* u) *J* <uos> *Camerarius* dicetis *V*: ditetis (*vix* -ris) *E*: dictetis *J* 994. meus est *VJ* gnatust meus *Schoellius*

---

990. **Quid tu ais?** 'and you, what do you say to this?' The *tu* has a certain emphasis, so scan *quid tŭ a-* as a dactyl. The phrase is similarly used in v. 627, where Hegio turns from Aristophontes to ask Tyndarus what he in his turn has to say on the matter. Often however *quid tu ais* merely expresses wondering surprise, like our 'what!,' e.g. v. 289. **Ipsus,** the emphatic form of *ipse*, is normal in phrases of this type, e.g. *Asin.* 379 *illest ipsus*, Cist. 602 *is ipsust*, Merc. 759 *tu istic ipsu's*, Poen. 1046 *ego sum ipsus quem tu quaeris*, Trin. 985 *ego sum ipsus Charmides*, 987 *is ipsusne's?*, as also in combination with *se*, *suus*, *sibi* (see note on v. 461).

991. **Ut quidem.** *Poen.* 663 *nam hic latro in Sparta fuit, Út quidem ipse nobis dixit.* **Argumenta,** as in *Amph.* 1087 *De ea re signa atque argumenta paucis uerbis eloquar*, Rud. 1180 *Quae ex te poterit argumentis hanc rem magis exquirere.*

992. **Bene pudiceque.** This was a combination in common use. Cf. *Amph.* 349 *Bene pudiceque adseruatur*, Cist. 173 *Eaque educauit eam sibi pro filia Bene ac pudice*, Curc. 518 *Bene ego istam eduxi meae domi et pudice*, Ter. *Andr.* 274 *Bene et pudice eius doctum atque eductum sinam Coactum egestate ingenium inmutarier?*

993. **Miser sum.** The ictus *misér sum* (the normal ictus of this phrase in Plautus) corresponds with what would probably be the accentuation (see Appendix). *Sum miser* is a variation found at the end of a line, &c., i.e. through metrical necessity. **Si <uos>.** This is Camerarius' supplement of the defect in the line. Bach proposes *si* <*istaec*>, others <*sum*>, *si*.

Eheu, quom ego plus minusque feci quam me aequom fuit.
Quod male feci crucior; modo si infectum fieri possiet.
Sed eccum incedit huc ornatus haud ex suis uirtutibus.

---

995. quom] *J n. l.* minusue *Gronovius ad Men.* IV 2, 35 quam (*om.* me) *libri* (qua B^1, *corr.* B^3): quam <me> *Brixius*, *Bentleius*: quamde *Gulielmius Qu. in Capt. p.* 358: quam <quae> *Spengelius T.M.P. p.* 226 *sq.* equom *VE*: aequum *J* 996. crutior *V* 997. ornatur *VE* haud ex *Muretus ad Ter. Ad.* II 1, 22: audax *libri* uiribus *J*

---

995. **Eheu, quom.** *Mil.* 1358 *Eheu, quom uenit mi in mentem, ut mores mutandi sient*, Poen. 791 *Eheu, quom ego habui hariolos haruspices.* So *ei mihi quom* Men. 304, Ter. *Andr.* 622. On the Mood, see note on v. 151. **Plus minusque** is usually changed by editors to *plus minusue*, the form in which the phrase occurs (in a different context) in Ter. *Phorm.* 554 *Ne quid plus minusue faxit, quod nos post pigeat, Geta.* Another form appears in *Men.* 592 *Aut plus aut minus quam opus fuerat dicto dixeram controuersiam*, in the sense of 'about,' 'nearly.' Here *plus minusque* of the MSS. should be retained. Hegio had done both too much evil and too little good to his son. **Quam me aequom fuit.** The loss of *me* in the MSS. between *quam* and *aequom* is so natural, that we can hardly resist the accepted restoration of the metre of the line. At the same time *Aul.* 424 *minús quam aéquom erat feci* offers the phrase in the same form with (apparently) legitimate hiatus after *quam.* **Fuit** is the Past Tense of that *est* which is normal in the phrase *aequom est*, 'it would be just.' Cf. *Merc.* 81 *odio me esse quoi placere aequom fuit*, Mil. 725 *aequom fuit Deos parauisse, uno exemplo ne omnes uitam uiuerent. Fuerat* however often takes its place, e.g. *Trin.* 119 *Ei rei operam dare te fuerat aliquanto aequius, Si qui probiorem facere posses.* (See note on v. 17.)

996. **Quod male feci.** Cf. v. 941, *Mil.* 468 *Nimis beat quod commeatus transtinet trans parietem.* The Relative-clause has a corresponding Demonstrative in lines like Ter. *Eun.* 81 *uereor ne illud grauius tulerit...Quod heri intro missus non est*, Haut. 909 *Quid? istuc times, quod ille operam amico dat suo?* (See note on v. 586.)

997. **Ornatus haud ex suis uirtutibus.** This was apparently a current phrase, for it recurs in Ter. *Adel.* 176:

A. regnumne, Aeschine, hic tu possides?
B. Si possiderem, ornatus esses ex tuis uirtutibus.

Hermann refers to this line the note of an ancient commentator (Sisenna) on the *Captivi*, which is quoted by Rufinus in his treatise on the metres of

[redacted]

TYNDARVS, HEGIO, PHILOCRATES. V. iv.

TYND. Vidi ego multa saepe picta, quae Acherunti fierent

V. iv. HEIO *B* (=*B*ᵃ): EGIO *J* PHYLOCRATES *B* (=*B*ᵃ) *EJ* 998. TYND. *om. E* idi *c. sp. init. libri* (Vidi *J*) sepe *libri* acheronti *VEJ*

Terence (*Gramm. Lat.* ed. Keil, vi. p. 561, 8): *Sisenna...in Captivis sic hic ornatu s litteram metri causa amisit.* Ritschl referred it to v. 447. Many ingenious theories have been made to explain Sisenna's meaning; but none can be called satisfactory.

Act V. Scene iv. (Trochaic Septenarii). Tyndarus is brought on the stage (from the left side) in his labour-garb, loaded with chains (v. 1025), and carrying a pickaxe (*upupa* v. 1004). He is told of his relationship to Hegio and the play ends happily.

998 sqq. These lines are spoken by Tyndarus as he crosses the stage.

998. **Multa saepe.** See note on v. 44. **Picta.** Such paintings were common in antiquity. The most famous was the picture by Polygnotus in the Lesché or arcade of Delphi, described by Pausanias. Another was by Nicias, a contemporary of Praxiteles. Cf. Demosth. *Aristog.* i. 52 *οἱ ζωγράφοι τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς ἐν Ἅιδου γράφουσιν.* A large number of amphorae from Apulia have paintings of this kind. On the walls of Etruscan tombs Charon, the messenger of death, appears as a hideous monster, in contrast to the mild treatment by the Greek painters of the punishments in the other world. (See Gardner, *Sculptured Tombs*, ch. iii.; Dieterich, *Nekyia*, p. 138.) **Acherunti,** probably with long *ī*, like *Sicyonī* Cist. 156. The Locative case-suffix of Consonant stems was -*ĭ*, which became -*ĕ*, e.g. *Carthagine, rure.* Third Decl. forms like *Carthaginī, rurī, Sicyonī, Acherunti* seem to have been originally Ablatives in -*īd* (see note on v. 914). This Locative of *Acheruns* recurs in v. 689. In Greek Ἀχέρων is Masc.; but the Latin popular form *A(c)cheruns* was Fem., as we see from v. 999 and from a dramatic quotation in Cicero *Tusc.* I. xvi. 37: *aperto ex ostio Altae Acheruntis.* On the form see Introd. ii. § 11. **Fierent,** Subj., as in *Men.* 143 *enumquam tu uidisti tabulam pictam in pariete, ubi aquila Catameitum raperet?, Truc.* 81 (see note on v. 1034), Cic. *Cat. Maj.* 3, 7 *Quorum ego multorum cognoui senectutem sine querela, qui se et libidinum vinculis laxatos esse non moleste ferrent nec a suis despicerentur, Or.* 51, 171 *Legi enim audivique nonnullos, quorum propemodum absolute concluderetur oratio,* &c.

Cruciamenta, uerum enim uero nulla adaeque est Acheruns
Atque ubi ego fui, in lapicidinis. illic ibi demumst locus,
Vbi labore lassitudost exigunda ex corpore.
Nam ubi illo adueni, quasi patriciis pueris aut monerulae
Aut anites aut cotornices dantur, quicum lusitent,
Itidem haec mihi aduenienti upupa, qui me delectem, datast.

---

999. *versum laudat Nonius p.* 191, 27 (*s. v.* Acherontem) 'uerum...fui' Crutiamenta *VE* uirum *V* (*corr. rec. ut vid.*) adequae *VE*: adaequae *J* achaeruns *B*: acherons *EJ cum Nonio* 1000. ego *s. v. V* lapricidinas *B*: lapricidinis *VE* demunst *E*: demum est *VJ* 1001. lassitudost *Boeckh, Bentleius*: lassitudo (l *ex* s *B*) est omnes (omnis B^3J) *libri* 1002. patricus B^1 (*corr.* B^3): patritus *VE* 1003. *versum laudat Osbernus p.* 303 'coturnices dantur quibuscum lusitent' aut cotornices *VE*: a cotornices (o *ex* u *ut vid.*) *B*: aut coturnices *J* qui cum *ex* qui coum *E* lusitent *BVE*: i lusitent (*ex* ilusitent) *J* 1004. mihi haec *VE*: michi hec *J* aduementi *J* hupupa *J* qui *adscr.* uel e *J* delectem *Lambinus post alios*: delectet *libri* data est *VJ*

1000. **Illic** is probably the Pronoun, agreeing with *locus*, rather than the Adverb. Brix compares Cic. *Rosc. Amer.* v. 13 *ne hic ibidem ante oculos uestros trucidetur*, where *hic ibidem* is Gk. αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ, as in *Mil.* 666 *hinc indidem* is Gk. ἐνθένδ' αὐτόθεν.

1001. **Lassitudost.** The MSS. have *lassitudo est omnis*, the last word (which in minuscule MSS. is generally written in contracted form oīs) having possibly arisen through some scribe's unfamiliarity with the orthography *-ost* for *-oest*.

1002. **Monerulae.** This is also the spelling of the word in its other occurrence in Plautus (*Asin.* 694).

1003. **Quicum.** The old Instr. Abl. (Loc. ?) Sing. *qui* was already in the time of Plautus becoming a mere Conjunction 'wherewith,' used without reference to Number. Cf. *Stich.* 292 *quadrigas qui uehar*, Pseud. 487 *uiginti minas...quas meo amico des, qui amicam liberet.* We do however find also *quibuscum*, e.g. *Bacch.* 564. **Lusitent.** It is possible that the inferior MS. J has in this line preserved the actual reading of the archetype *quicum i lusitent.*

1004. **Upupa.** Our 'crow' lends itself to the same pun. Cf. "Go, borrow me a crow. A crow without feather?" *Comedy of Errors* III. i. **Qui me delectem, datast.** On the Tenses see note on arg. v. 7. The

[redacted]

Sed erus eccum ante ostium, et erus alter eccum ex Alide
Rediit. HEG. Salue, exoptate gnate mi. TYND. Hem, quid 'gnate mi'?
Attat, scio cur te patrem adsimules esse et me filium:

1005. erus] *J n. l.* hostium *VJ* ostium est *Brixius Annal. phil. t.* CXXIII (*a.* 1881) *p.* 57 herus *J* eccum (u *in ras.*) *B* 1006. Redit *libri* <o> salue *Spengelius Philol.* XXXVII *p.* 449, *Fergerus de uoc. usu Plaut. p.* 28 hem *ex* g- *ut vid. B* (*B*ª?): em *VE* 1007. scio *s. v. E* esse adsimules *Guietus, Bentleius* assimules *J* me *s. v. J*

position of the Final *qui*-Clause in the middle of the sentence is exceptional. Contrast, e.g. v. 341, *Most.* 978 *quadraginta etiam dedit huic, quae essent pignori.*

1005. **Sed erus eccum ante ostium.** We should expect either *erum eccum* or *erus eccum adest* (see note on v. 169). Brix changes *et* to *est* or *st*:

Sed erus eccum ante ostiumst, erus alter eccum ex Alide Rediit.

But *eccum* is not used with the Simple Verb *est*, but only with *adest*, *astat*, *incedit*, &c., the practice being to use the other form of expression, e.g. *erum eccum*, in cases where the Simple Verb *est* would be required. Leo retains the reading of the MSS., supposing that the Verb *rediit* of the second clause does duty for *astat* or *adest* in the first clause. It is at least equally probable that *erum* has been changed to *erus* in some archetype. (On the legitimate hiatus *Séd erŭm éccum*, see Introd. ii. § 40.) In *Rud.* 1174 we have something of a parallel to this line: *Ego sum Daemones, et mater tua eccam* (*ecca* MSS.) *hic intus Daedalis*, where some editors change *intus* to *intust.*

1006. **Salue.** Fleckeisen proposed *salueto*, which however is never found at the beginning of a clause (cf. *Rud.* 103 *pater, salueto*, 416 *salue, adulescens*). Spengel's *O salue* is a preferable way of removing the hiatus (cf. *Men.* 1132 *O salue, insperate...frater*). But it is quite conceivable that a pause followed *salue* (Introd. ii. § 44). **Gnate mi** (cf. 1021). The normal order of these Vocatives with *mi*, *meus* seems rather to be after than before the Possessive, the reverse order being adopted through metrical necessity, e.g. at the end of a line (as here) or a hemistich. For a full list of instances see Ferger, *de usu Vocativi Plautino Terentianoque* (a Strassburg dissertation), 1889, pp. 14 sqq. **Quid 'gnate mi'?** In this form of expression the case, tense, &c. of the repeated word is not changed. Cf. *Pseud.* 1187 A. *Domino demeret.* B. *Quid 'domino'?*, *Bacch.* 147 A. *Caue malo.* B. *Quid 'caue malo'?*, &c., &c.

Quia mi item ut parentes lucis das tuendi copiam.
PHILOCR. Salue, Tyndare. TYND. Et tu, quoius causa hanc aerumnam exigo.
PHILOCR. At nunc liber in diuitias faxo uenies, nam tibi

1008. *accedit A* QViamihiitemutPARentesL—— *A* Qui *VE* mihi *libri* parentes *ex* pap- *B* tuendae *J* 1009. *versum laudat Nonius p.* 291, 17 (*s. v.* exigere) 'salue...exigo' SA——QVO *A* tindare *VE* quouis B^1 (*corr.* B^3) *E*: quae uis *V*: cuius *J cum codd. Nonii* (*A n. l.*) erumnam *libri* (erumpnam *J*, *A n. l.*) exiguo *A ut vid. B* 1010. A—— *A* diuicias *B* nam (na *e corr.*) *B*

1008. **Lucis tuendi copiam.** This construction seems to be rightly described as a patchwork of the older *lucem tuendi* and the classical *lucis tuendae*. And the theory that the preponderance of examples with the Gen. Plur. (e.g. v. 852, Ter. *Haut.* prol. 29) is due to the avoidance of the harsh sound of the repeated Gen. Plural ending is probably right. For example, in Cicero *Phil.* v. 3. 6 *agitur utrum M. Antonio facultas detur... agrorum suis latronibus condonandi*, the combination *agrorum condonandorum* would offend the ear. But it is wrong to reject all examples of the Gen. Sing. on account of the smallness of their number. In Ennius *Trag.* 207 R. (ap. Rhet. ad Herenn. ii. 22. 34):

> Neue inde nauis incohandi exordium
> Coepisset, quae nunc nominatur nomine
> Argo,

the true reading *incohandi* has been changed to *-dae* in some MSS. (which would violate the law against elision of *-ae* Gen. Sing.; cf. Introd. ii. § 5); and mediaeval scribes would always be prone to efface this old construction in the same way. This fact may account for the paucity of examples. The Adverbial phrase *luci claro* (*Aul.* 748) (cf. *cum primo luci* Cist. 525; but *inlucescas luce clara et candida* Amph. 547) seems rather to be an adaptation to the type of *claro die*, &c. (cf. Germ. 'des Nachts,' like 'des Tages'), than to be a relic of a Neuter stem *luci-*; and cannot be cited as certain evidence that *tuendi* here is Neut. of the Gerundive, agreeing with *lucis*.

1009. **Et tu,** the common formula of returning a salutation; also *et tu edepol*, e.g. *Poen.* 1039 A. *O mi popularis salue.* B. *Et tu edepol, quisquis es.* Sometimes the reply is merely a repetition of *salue*, e.g. *Rud.* 1052 A. *O ere, salue.* B. *Salue, Gripe, quid fit?*

[redacted]

Pater hic est: hic seruus, qui te huic hinc quadrimum surripuit,
Vendidit patri meo te sex minis, is te mihi
Paruolum peculiarem paruolo puero dedit
Illi; <hi>c indicium fecit; nam hunc ex Alide huc reducimus.
TYND. Quid huius filium? PHILOCR. Intus eccum fratrem germanum tuum.

1011. PATERK—|— *A* 1012. VEND^{idi}T—— *A* michi *EJ* 1013. P^{ar}-VVL—— *A* Paruul— (-uol-?) *A*: Paruulum *ceteri* (*J n. l.*) pecculiarem *J* paruolo *J*: paruulo *ceteri* (*A n. l.*) 1014. ILL—— *A* Illic ind. *libri* (*A n. l.*): *correxi* Id hic *Leo* inditium *VE*: indicium *an* iud- *incert. J* huc] hunc *VE* reduximus *Pareus ex cod.* (*A n. l.*) 1015. QV^{id}KYIVS—|— *A* *om.* fratrem B^1 (*add. in marg.* B^3 *ut vid.*) tuum (um *e corr.*) *B* (*A n. l.*)

1014. **Illi hic.** The MSS. have *illic* (i.e. *illĭc*, 'ille') which can hardly be tolerated in proximity to *hunc*, although *ille* often takes the place of the anaphoric Pronoun in Plautus, e.g. *Epid.* 267 *fidicinam Illam, quam is uolt liberare, quae illum conrumpit tibi.* Leo proposes *Id hic*; but since the line in the Palimpsest also began with *ill-*, I prefer Schoell's *illi* (i.e. 'in Elis') to *id*, and make it end one sentence, while *hic* begins another. Brix retains *illĭc*, but changes *hunc* to *huius*, and supposes Tyndarus to interrupt Philocrates before the sentence is completed: *nam huius ex Alide huc reduximus*—TYND. *Quid, huius filium?* **Reducimus.** I venture, with some misgivings, to retain the tense offered by the MSS. Most editors change it to *reduximus.* For the combination of Historical Present with the Perfect Tense, cf. *Cas.* 549 *flagitium maxumum feci miser ...operam uxoris polliceor foras,* Ter. *Hec.* 816 *Quantum obtuli aduentu meo laetitiam Pamphilo hodie...gnatum ei restituo...qua re suspectus suo patri... fuit, exsolui.*

1015. **Eccum.** There is nothing peculiar in this use of *eccum* to refer to a person not actually on the stage. **Fratrem germanum,** a common expression, e.g. *Men.* 1102. So *germana soror* Aul. 122, &c. In Spanish Lat. *germanus* supplies the word for brother ('hermano') and sister ('hermana'), while Lat. *frater* has become restricted to the sense of a religious brother ('fratre').

1016 sqq. In the Ambrosian Palimpsest vv. 1016—1022 are omitted. They belonged apparently to one version of the play, the version followed by the Palatine text, while in the other version (followed by A) they were replaced by a single line, v. 1023 (cf. ad vv. 46—51 supra). This single

TYND. Quid tu ais? adduxtin illum huius captiuum filium?
PHILOCR. Quin, inquam, intus hic est. TYND. Fecisti edepol et recte et bene.
PHILOCR. Nunc tibi pater hic est: hic fur est tuus, qui paruum hinc te abstulit.
TYND. At ego hunc grandis grandem natu ob furtum ad carnuficem dabo.
PHILOCR. Meritus est. TYND. Ergo edepol merito meritam mercedem dabo.
Sed <tu> dic, oro: pater meus tune es? HEG. Ego sum, gnate mi.
TYND. Nunc demum in memoriam redeo, cum mecum recogito,
Nunc edepol demum in memoriam regredior audisse me,

1016—1022. *om. A* 1016. aduxtin *B* huius *ex* huis *ut vid. B* fil. capt. *libri*: *corr. Pylades*: capt. hui. fil. *Fleckeisenus* 1017. PHILOCR. *e corr.* (*ras.*) *in V* 1018. tibi B^3 *in ras.* 1019. hunc B^3: nunc *ceteri* gradem B^1 (*corr.* B^3) carnuficem *J*: carnificem *ceteri* 1020. PHILOCR. *om. libri* (*J n. l.*) TYND. *om. libri* (*add. J*) aedepol *B* merito *om. libri*: *add. Gruterus* 1021. <tu> *Havetus rev. de philol. t.* XVI (*ann.* 1892) *p.* 72 sūn *B* 1022. TYND. *om. B* 1023. NVNCEDEPOLdeM——RREDISSEME *A* aedepol *B* audissem (e *ex* i *B*) me *BJ*

---

line has found its way (from the margin; see Introd. i. § 16) into the text of the Palatine family also. The scansion *regrediŏr*, v. 1023, has the stamp of antiquity.

1016. **Huius captiuum filium.** This transposition is the least violent restoration of the unmetrical reading of the MSS. *huius filium captiuum.* Fleckeisen proposed *illum captiuom huius filium*, while Schoell retains the order of the MSS. and supposes *ita*, 'yes' (belonging to the reply of Philocrates), to have been lost at the end of the line.

1017. **Hic**, probably the Adverb.

1020. **Merito meritam**, a favourite jingle; cf. v. 935, *Cas.* 1015, *Curc.* 185, etc.

1021. **Pater meus.** So *Curc.* 603, *Poen.* 1069 (cf. 1051); always with the ictus *patér meus* (except *Amph.* 104, where *meus pater* is probably the true reading). The normal order is *méus-pater.* (See note on v. 936.)

1022. **In memoriam redeo.** Ter. *Phorm.* 802 *Non temere dico: redii mecum in memoriam*, Cic. *Verr.* II. i. 46 *redite in memoriam, iudices*, *Cat. Maj.* 7 *in memoriam redeo mortuorum.*

Quasi per nebulam, Hegionem meum patrem uocarier.
HEG. Is ego sum. PHILOCR. Compedibus quaeso ut tibi sit leuior filius
Atque huic grauior seruos. HEG. Certum est principio id praeuortier.
Eamus intro, ut arcessatur faber, ut istas conpedis
Tibi adimam, huic dem. STAL. Quoi peculi nihil est, recte feceris.

CATERVA.

Spectatores, ad pudicos mores facta haec fabula est,

1024. QVASIPERNE[bu]L[amhe]GIO——OCARIER *A* egionem *J* 1025. ISEGOSVM*[c]OM[pe]DIB——EVIORFILIVS *A* Is *A*: *om. ceteri* PHILOCR. *B*[3]: TYND. *ceteri* (*A n. l.*) quaeso *V* (*A n. l.*): queso *BEJ* 1026. ATQ·KVICGRAVIOR[se]RVVS-CERTVSTPRINCIPIQIDPRAEOR|TIER *A* huic *A*: hic *ceteri* seruus (*vix* -uos) *A*: seruos *ex* seruus *J*: seruus *ceteri* HEG. *om. A* certust *A*: certum est *ceteri* principio *ut vid. A*: principium *ceteri* praeor- *A*: preuortier *BV* 1027. EAMVS-IN[tr]OVTACCERSATVRFABER[utistascompede]S *A* compedis *BV*: compedes *J* (*A n. l.*). TIBIADIMAMKVICDEMQVOIPECV[li]NIKILESTRECTEFECERIS *A* STAL. *om. A*: SERVVS *ceteri* quoi *A*: cui *ceteri* peculii *B*[3] *ut vid. VEJ* nichil *EJ* **Cat.** *versus vacuus ut vid. A*: CATERVA *ceteri* 1029. S[pec]TATORESADPVDICOS-MORESFACTAKAECFABVLAEST *A* pectatores *om. sp. in. V* (s *man. rec.*) hec *J*

1024. The Hiatus has been removed in various ways, e.g. *nebulas*, *nebulam* <*tum*>, &c., but most simply by the scansion *quăsi* (or *quam si*, Introd. ii. § 13). If we retain it, we must suppose Tyndarus to pause before mention of the name *Hegionem* (Introd. ii. § 44). **Quasi per nebulam.** *Pseud.* 462:

Sunt quae te uolumus percontari, quae quasi
Per nebulam nosmet scimus atque audiuimus.

1026. **Huic.** The manuscript tradition varies between *huic* and *hic*. Brix prefers the latter. **Principio id praeuortier.** *Pseud.* 602 *Hoc praeuortar principio* (AP). On *praeuortor* see note on v. 460. It would be unwise to found on the spelling *praeortier* in A any theory of the pronunciation of the word (cf. Introd. ii. § 9). The spelling is probably a mere clerical error, like *praeuolat* for *praeolat* in the Palatine MSS. at *Mil.* 41.

1029. The whole troupe appear on the stage to make the closing appeal to the audience. From Horace's remark (*A. P.* 154—5):

Si plausoris eges aulaea manentis et usque
Sessuri, donec cantor 'Vos plaudite' dicat,

Neque in hac subigitationes sunt neque ulla amatio
Nec pueri suppositio nec argenti circumductio,
Neque ubi amans adolescens scortum liberet clam suum patrem.
Huius modi paucas poetae reperiunt comoedias,
Vbi boni meliores fiant. nunc uos, si uobis placet,
Et si placuimus neque odio fuimus, signum hoc mittite:
Qui pudicitiae esse uoltis praemium, plausum date.

1030. *A n. l.* **subicogitationes** *VE*: **subite cogitationes** *J* **nequlla** *J* 1031. ^{ne}c—— *A* supposicio *B* circunductio *J* (*ex* circū-) **1032.** *A n. l.* 1033. *A n. l.* poete *E* comedias *libri* (*A n. l.*) **1034.** v—— *A* *post* fiant 3 *litt. spat. B* 1035. *A n. l.* hodio *J* fuimus (us *add.* *E*[3] *ut vid.*) *E* 1036. *A n. l.* pudicitie (t *ex* c) *B*: puditiciae *V* premium *VEJ*. ——|CA^{ptiui}—— *A* : PLAVTI CAPTIVI EXPLICIT *ceteri*

---

we see that it was the practice of the 'cantor' to utter the 'Plaudite' with which most plays of Plautus and Terence end. But the 'codex Turnebi' shews us that in the *Persa* at least this 'Plaudite' was pronounced by the whole troupe, for it preserves the stage direction πάντες, which has been merged in the customary symbol ω in the other minuscule MSS., and has produced the 'vox nihili' *pantio*. "Similar epilogues close the *Asinaria* and the *Cistellaria*, but usually the plays end with a simple appeal for applause, as in v. 1036." Morris.

1031. The metre seems correct enough. If a change were required, I should prefer *nec circum argenti ductio* to *aut argenti circumductio*. Plautus does not use *aut* in this way.

1034. **Boni meliores.** This combination of Positive and Comparative is much affected by Plautus, e.g. *Bacch.* 3 *saeuitudo mala fit peior*, Mil. 1218 *nos malas peiores fieri*, Stich. 739 *fac nos hilaros hilariores*. Cf. *Amph.* 704 *ex insana insaniorem facies*, Cas. 1006 *Hanc ex longa longiorem ne faciamus fabulam.* **Fiant.** The sense of purpose can hardly be attributed to this sentence. For the Subjunctive after *reperire* &c. *qui* cf. v. 568 (see note), *Truc.* 81 *Eadem postquam alium repperit, qui plus daret.* So after *nancisci qui* Capt. 154, Poen. 1287 *Nanctus est hominem, mina quem argenti circumduceret.* Cf. *Trin.* 89 *Haben tu amicum aut familiarem quempiam, Quoi pectus sapiat?*

1035. **Odio**, 'ennui,' as in *Poen.* 51, 922, etc.

1036. **Pudicitiae** Dat. Cf. *Poen.* 1190 *redde is libertatem, inuictae praemium ut esse sciam pietati.*

[redacted]

FRAGMENTVM.

Nonius p. 220, 12: pilleus generis masculini. Plautus Captiuis 'pilleum quem habuit diripuit eumque ad caelum tollit'] deripuit *Bothius* *in nomine fabulae erratum esse coniecit Schoellius.*

Fragm. The line quoted by Nonius is as likely as not to belong to some other play. The theory that it refers to an incident in the history of Tyndarus, and was related by his abductor in Act v. Sc. ii., is out of keeping with the surly, uncommunicative character attributed by Plautus to Stalagmus. In view of the usual hiatus in the phrases *quem habet*, *quem habuit*, &c. I would make *pilleum* end one line and *quem* begin another:

pilleum
Quém habuit derípuit eumque ad caélum tollit...

[redacted]

APPENDIX.

THE ACCENTUAL ELEMENT IN EARLY LATIN VERSE.

1. The Law of Latin Accentuation (known as the 'Paenultima Law') is a very simple one, namely, that the accent falls on the antepenultimate syllable, if the paenultima be short; on the paenultima itself, if long, e.g. *décŏres, decōres.* The accent never falls on the final syllable, except in the case of syncopated or apocopated words like *abît* for *abivit*, *horúnc* for *horúnc(e)*. But there are traces in Latin, as Corssen proved, of an older Accentuation, by which the accent fell on the first syllable of every word. Cases of Syncope like *quindecim* for *quinquĕ-decem*, and of Vowel-reduction like *triennium* from *tri-* (*tres*) and *annus*, *concīdo* (*conceido*) from *cum* and *caedo* (*caido*), point unmistakably to an early *quínque-decem*, *trí-anniom*, *cón-caido*, &c. At what precise period the change, no doubt a gradual one, from this older Accentuation to the Paenultima Law began and completed itself, it is difficult to ascertain. But there is some evidence that it was still incomplete in one particular in the period of the Early Drama, for words (or endings of words) of the metrical form ⏑⏑⏑⏓ seem at that period to have been still accented on the first and not on the antepenultimate syllable. Thus *balineae* (the Plautine form), *pueritia*, &c. seem to have had in Plautus' time the accentuation *bálineae*, *puéritia*, which explains their subsequent reduction to *bálneae*, *puértia* (cf. Hor. *actas non alio rege puertiae*)[1]. And a word like *dīmidius* (from *medius*) was probably still accented on the first syllable about 250 B.C., for the change of unaccented *ĕ* to *ĭ* seems not to be earlier than that time, and is not found on the oldest inscriptions. But though we cannot fix the time when Latin words passed from the old to the classical accentuation, when, for example, *sápientia* became *sapiéntia*, *témpestatibus* became *tempestátibus*, we can guess, partly from the analogy of other languages, partly from the inherent probabilities of the case, what the nature of that change was. A long word like *sapientia*, *tempestatibus* must have had at all periods a secondary as well as a main

[1] A detailed account of these forms in Plautus will be found in *Philologus*, vol. li., pp. 364 sqq.

accent; it could hardly be pronounced otherwise, as we can see from our own pronunciation of such words as 'chàracterístical' (with secondary accent on first, main accent on fourth syllable). So that the old accentuation *sápientia* would be more accurately expressed as *sápièntia*. The change from the old accentuation to the new would be, in reality, nothing but a usurpation by the secondary accent of the prominence of the main accent: *sápièntia* would become *sàpiéntia*, *témpestàtibus* would become *tèmpestátibus*. The secondary accent of long words is generally ignored in the Latin Grammarians' accounts of accentuation, though it seems to be what Varro alludes to by the term *media prosodia*. But in any investigation of the relation of the metrical ictus to the natural accent of words in Plautus, we must bear it in mind. Even four-syllabled words of the form –⏑⏑⏓, e.g. *flagitium*, may have retained in his time a distinct secondary accent (the old main accent) on the first syllable as well as the main accent (the old secondary accent) on the paenultima, *flàgítium*[1]. We must also remember that *bálineae*, *puéritia*, &c., not *balíneae*, *puerítia*, &c., seem to have been the Plautine accentuations.

2. The Latin accentuation of the sentence, as distinguished from the accentuation of words by themselves, may be determined with a fair amount of accuracy, partly by the help of the remarks of the Latin Grammarians, partly from observing the phonetic changes of Latin words and of their descendants in the Romance tongues, where an accented word or syllable is not subject to the same laws of development as an unaccented, partly from the analogy of other languages. Examples of Sentence-enclitics are: (1) Enclitic Particles like *quĕ*, *vĕ*, *nĕ* (Interrogative). These were written as appendages of the preceding word, e.g. *Caesarque*, *Ciceroque*, *atque* (weakened in pronunciation to **atc*, *ac*); (2) the various parts of the Substantive Verb, e.g. *est*, *sunt*, *erat*, *erit*, *foret*, &c. *Es*, *est* are written in the best MSS. of Plautus, Virgil, &c., as appendages of a Perf. Part. Pass., *amatus* (printed by us *amatu's*), *amatust*, *amatast*, *amatumst* for *amatus-es*, *amatus-est*, *amata-est*, *amatum-est*. It need hardly be said that the extent to which these words, and indeed all Sentence-enclitics, were suppressed, would depend on the caprice of the speaker, on the nuance of thought, on the style of composition, &c. No hard and fast rule can be laid down about them, just as no rule could be made for the use of ''s' for 'is,' ''re' for 'are in English. (3) The personal, possessive and demonstrative pronouns when unemphatic. Unemphatic *ille* has dwindled into the definite article in Romance. (4) Auxiliary Verbs like *do*, *volo* (our 'will,' 'shall') in verbal word-groups like *pessum-do*, *coctum-dabo*, *factum-volo*, and even in other word-groups, e.g. *quantum-vis*. (5) Nouns of subordinate meaning like *res* (cf. our 'sóme-thing,' 'nó-thing'), e.g. *quá-re*,

[1] The incidence of two accents, one main and the other secondary, on neighbouring syllables has nothing unnatural about it. Cf. our 'fortnightly,' 'householder,' Germ. 'entsagen.' The Italian spelling *seppelire* (Lat. *sepelire*), *scellerato* (Lat. *sceleratus*) is due to the secondary accent on the initial syllable.

[redacted]

quó-modo. (6) Prepositions (as opposed to Adverbs). Before Nouns in Latin orthography these were often written as in Compound Verbs, e.g. *in cursum*, *in templum* were written *incursum*, *intemplum* like *incurro*, &c. (7) Relatives or Indefinites (as opposed to Interrogatives) (cf. 'Whó is the pérson who deníes it?'). (8) Certain Conjunctions, unless specially emphasized. Thus Donatus mentions the different signification conveyed by accented and unaccented *si* in the phrase *si quando* (see below). The accentuation of *si* implied doubt on the part of the speaker. (For details of Latin Sentence-Accentuation see my *Latin Language*, ch. III.)

3. The Latin Grammarians generally content themselves with citing these words as the Latin equivalents of the Greek Enclitics (*τε*, *ἐστι*, *τις*, *εἰς*, *εἰ*, &c.), and do not state the precise details of their pronunciation in Latin, a statement which would indeed imply more familiarity with the science of Phonetics than could be expected in their time. Quintilian however gives us the valuable hint that these subordinate words in Latin were really fused into a compound with their neighbouring word, e.g. *circum-litora* in Virgil (*Inst. Or.* I. v. 25: *cum dico 'circumlítora,' tanquam unum enuntio dissimulata distinctione, itaque tanquam in una voce una est acuta*), though how far we may press the conclusions that seem naturally to result from his statement is doubtful. It has been suggested that in postposition of the Relative, e.g. *Troiae qui primus ab oris...venit*, the enclitic or subordinate Pronoun would be joined in pronunciation into one word-group with the preceding Noun with accentuation *Troiaé-qui*. (Cf. *qui homo*, a word-group in Plautus, scanned *quí-homo*.) At any rate we may be certain that in Latin, as in other languages, an enclitic became accented before another enclitic. Prepositions were subordinate in stress to the nouns which they accompany, e.g. *ad-úrbem*, but before an enclitic pronoun would receive the accent, e.g. *ád-me*. Cf. our 'wíth-him,' 'fór-him.' When the pronoun was emphatic, it of course would receive the stress, e.g. *ad-mé non ad-té*. Cf. our 'with-hím, not with-hér.'

4. The Latin Accent was mainly an accent of stress, and different from the Greek accent of tone or pitch, though its stress was not strong enough, except in special circumstances (see Intr. ii. § 11), to overmaster the quantity of a vowel. An educated Roman pronounced *ōrator* with the stress of the voice on the second syllable, but without impairing the quantity of the initial *o*; the final *o* of *ponō* retained its length, in spite of the fact that the stress of the voice fell on the first syllable; the first syllable of *píper* had the stress-accent along with the short quantity, and so on[1]. It was thus possible for the Romans to imitate the quantitative metres of the Greeks, in which the harmonious or metrical element of the line consisted of the regular arrangement of long and of short syllables.

[1] But in course of time stress conquered quantity. In the early Empire *ponŏ* became the universal pronunciation, and we hear later of *ŏrator* and *pīper* as current mispronunciations (Consentius, p. 391 K).

Ennius could imitate the Dactylic Hexameters of Homer without being driven to that substitution of accented syllables for long syllables and of unaccented for short which we see in English imitations of Greek dactyls:

"Thís is the fórest priméval; the múrmuring pínes and the hémlocks."

But a stress-accent like the Latin could hardly be kept from asserting itself in Roman poetry; and, as a matter of fact, we find that the changes which the Greek metres underwent in the hands of these Roman imitators are, in many cases, clearly due to an attempt to reconcile the natural stress-accent of the words with the ictus or metrical beat of the line. The Dactylic Hexameters of Virgil and Ovid are hardly allowed any other ending than (1) – ⏑ ⏑, – ⏓, e.g. *moenia Romae*, or (2) – ⏑, ⏑ – ⏓, e.g. *magnus Apollo*; the Dactylic Pentameters of Ovid are practically confined to the ending – ⏑ ⏑(,) – ⏑, ⏑ ⏓, e.g. *praecipitata forent*, *moenia magna forent*, the last words being by preference enclitic or subordinate words, like *tibi*, *tuus*, *erat*, *fuit*, and the like. If we seek the reason why the Greek freedom of choice of endings is abandoned by the Romans, we shall hardly find a better one than the harmony of ictus and accent in the favoured endings, *moénia Rómae*, *mágnus Apóllo*, *praècipitáta forent*, *moénia mágna forent*, as contrasted with the conflict of ictus (´) and accent (″) in the rejected endings, e.g. '*tăndém cecidisti*,' '*praéc̆ipităt mĕlius*[1].' And side by side with the quantitative verse of literary Rome there was always existing in Vulgar Latin the old accentual poetry[2], of which we see traces in the rude songs of soldiers at triumphs, e.g. Suet. *Caes.* 80:

Écce Caésar núnc triúmphat quì-subégit Gállias,

a line which exhibits coincidence of accent and ictus, until at last with the advent of Christianity the 'poor man's poetry' became the poetry of the Church and the nation[3].

5. In discussing the laws of the various dramatic metres in Plautus, we have already noticed many instances of a regard for the natural accentuation of words, such as (1) that modification of the Greek Dipody law, by which spondees are freely allowed in the 'even' feet of Iambic and the 'odd' feet of Trochaic lines, but not frequently such a spondee as *-mícis* in the line:

[1] The details of a similar treatment of the Sapphic stanza by the Roman poets will be found in Brock, *Sapphische Strophe*, Marienwerder, 1890, P. Eichhoff, *Horazische Doppelbau der sapphischen Strophe*, Wandsbeck, 1895.

[2] On the accentual nature of the old native Italian poetry, the Saturnian, see *American Journal of Philology*, xiv. 139, 305.

[3] It has been remarked that some of the lines of the Early Tragedians read almost like anticipations of a Christian (accentual) hymn, e.g. Ennius *Trag.* 163 R. (an Iamb. Octonarius):

O mágna témpla caélitum, || commíxta stéllis spléndidis.

quam sí tu obicias fórmicis papáuerem.

(2) the complete avoidance of a metrical ictus like *genéra*, *pectoríbus* in tribrach-words and word-endings, and the almost complete avoidance[1] of the same in dactyl-words and word-endings, e.g. *pectóra*, *disperdére*. These laws, imposed on the Greek Dramatic Metres as soon as they were transplanted to Roman soil, reveal unmistakably the existence of an accentual, beside the quantitative element, in early Latin dramatic poetry[2]. To what extent does this accentual element assert itself?

6. As regards the accentuation of the single word (word-accent as opposed to sentence-accent) we find a wonderful amount of agreement between ictus and accent in the lines of Plautus. His greatest difficulty must, of course, have been with iambus-words like *fero*, *ferunt*, and it must have been increased by the large number of long final syllables in the language at his time, e.g. *ferŏr*, *ferāt* (see Intr. ii. § 1). The Latin Accent, as we have seen (§ 1), is excluded from the final syllable, so that the word-accent was *féro*, *férunt*, *féror*, *férat*. But the nature of the Iambic and Trochaic metres allows no opportunity for the ictus to fall on a short syllable immediately followed by a long syllable. The permissible ictus-forms in an Iambic line are (1) Iambus ⏑–́, (2) Spondee ––́, (3) Tribrach ⏑⏑́⏑, (4) Anapaest ⏑⏑–́, (5) Dactyl –⏑́⏑, (6) Proceleusmatic ⏑⏑⏑́⏑; in a Trochaic (1) Trochee –́⏑, (2) Spondee –́–, (3) Tribrach ⏑́⏑⏑, (4) Anapaest

[1] *Pectóra* &c. may be used in the first foot of an iambic (bacchiac, e.g. *Cist.* 686, &c.) line or hemistich, and (with *disperdére* &c.) in any part of an anapaestic line.

[2] Ritschl's dictum on the verse of the Latin Dramatists (*Prolegg.* ch. xv.): cum quantitatis severitate summam accentus observationem, quoad eius fieri posset, conciliatam esse, has never been successfully impugned. Prof. W. Meyer, in a long article in the *Proceedings of the Bavarian Academy* for 1884, has stated perhaps as powerful a case as can be stated against it. His main argument is that such coincidence as there is of accent and ictus in Plautus is really due to the law of Latin Accentuation, which requires every long penultimate syllable to be accented; the metrical ictus falls normally on long syllables in the line, and where these long syllables happen to be penultimate syllables, the ictus must coincide with the accent. There are thus, he says, more chances of the ictus and accent lighting on the same syllable in Latin than in Greek poetry, and this, and this only, is the reason of the coincidences to which Ritschl has drawn attention in Plautus. Then he proceeds to make a minute investigation into the technique of Plautus' versification, especially his treatment of the trochaic and iambic caesura, with the object of shewing that the avoidance of this and that form of caesura would compel the choice at certain parts of the line of such words as would necessarily have the ictus on the same syllable as the accent. These details of technique have been challenged by Prof. Langen in the *Philologus*, vol. xlvi., who also supplies us with a striking refutation of Meyer's main argument. He himself, he tells us, once made the experiment of applying the Latin accentual laws to the trimeters of Aristophanes, but found that the coincidence of accent and ictus was not at all so frequent as it is in the Senarii of Plautus and Terence, a fact which plainly indicates some other influence to be at work in the latter.

´⏑⏑–, (5) Dactyl ´⏑⏑, (6) Proceleusmatic ´⏑⏑⏑⏑. There is no room for an ictus like ´–, to reproduce the accurate pronunciation of a disyllabic word like *fero*, with short accented first syllable and long final syllable. This discrepancy furnishes the opponents of Ritschl's dictum with their strongest argument. How is it possible, they ask, to ascribe an accentual element to the verse of Plautus, when by the very nature of the metre used, the accent of those numerous iambic disyllables of common use would resist adaptation to the ictus or beat of the verse? Another argument, as frequently used as this one, is that an Iambic line must end with an Iambus (⏑´), which implies an ictus on the final syllable of the line, whereas an accent on the final syllable of a word is contrary to the Latin practice; and these two arguments are regarded by many persons as conclusive. And yet the very fact that Plautus evidently takes the greatest possible pains to overcome these two difficulties in the way of reconciling ictus and accent, is one of the strongest proofs that he aimed at such reconciliation. Let us examine his methods of dealing with these Iambus-words.

(1) In the first place, he avails himself of the tendency of Latin pronunciation to shorten their final syllable, a tendency which asserted itself most strongly in those ending with a long vowel followed by *-r*, *-t* (e.g. *ferŏr*, *ferăt*), and in many words which, ending in a long vowel, were closely joined with other words in ordinary rapid utterance, e.g. cavĕ-*fáxis*, domĭ-*résto*, domŏ-*vénio*, dabŏ-*plágam*, dedĭ-*plágam*, datŏ-*plágam*, citŏ-*cúrre*, modŏ-*véni*, probĕ-*fáctus*. (On this Law of Breves Breviantes see Intr. ii. § 16.)

(2) Or secondly, he so places them in the sentence that their accent is diverted from the first syllable, whether to the final, e.g. *bonaéque*, *bonaene*, *bonaéve*, *bonaé-sunt*, *malaé-res*, *fidém-dat*, or to a preceding word, e.g. *hóc-modo* (like *quómodo*), *aliquó-modo*, *coctúm-dabo*.

(3) Thirdly, he elides their final vowel.

The usual place to which he assigns an Iambus-word, scanned as an Iambus and with marked conflict of ictus and accent, is before a pause in the sentence, especially in the first foot of an Iambic line, e.g. *Trin.* 1—2:

> *A.* Sequere hác me, gnata, ut múnus fungarís tuom.
> *B.* *Sequór.* sed finem fóre quem dicam néscio,

where the disagreement would probably not be so marked. Before the last Dipody of the line, e.g. *Aul.* 581 *Atque istuc aurum quód* tibi *concréditumst*, and (the most frequent situation) at the end of a line Iambic words are preferred which would in ordinary utterance have no perceptible accent, e.g. *tuom*, *tibi* in the lines quoted above, which would be as much unaccented disyllables as the *-scio* of *nescio*. Cf. *hóc-modo*, *aliquó-modo*, *coctúm-dabo*, *factúm-volo*, &c. It is rarely that we find an Iambic word at the end of a line to be an important word in the sentence, as in *Stich.* 260:

[redacted]

A. Nullán tibi linguast? *B*. Quaé quidem dicát 'dabo':
Ventrí reliqui éccam quae dicát 'cedo.'

7. Apocopated words form an exception to the rule that the Latin accent (unlike the Greek) never falls on the final syllable. The Latin Grammarians quote as examples such words as *illíc* for *illí-c(e)*, *tantón* for *tantó-n(e)*, *Pyrrhín* for *Pyrrhí-n(e)*. That this pronunciation was departed from under special circumstances we see from the remark of Servius (ad *Aen.* vi. 779) that *vidĕn* (i.e. *vides-n(e)*) was the actual pronunciation of his time. Plautus too scans *vidĕn* as he often scans *vidĕs*, and similarly in other cases of elided *-qu(e)*, *-n(e)*. Thus we find *prosperĕqu(e)* (*Amph.* 463; cf. *Pseud.* 574), as we find *prosperĕ* on occasion. The normal incidence of ictus on such word-groups is the same as that on the single word, *surrúptasqu(e)* like *surrúptas*, &c., and may quite well reflect the actual pronunciation (for details see Ahlberg in *Lund Dissertations*, 1897, p. 31). The classical scansion of Neuter Adjectives which have lost final *-e* and become Nouns, e.g. *calcăr*, *animăl*, *bacchanăl*, shews that this rule of the Grammarians had not been observed in their case either. But the intermediate stage between, e.g. *bacchanâle* and *bacchânăl*, must have been *bacchanâl*; and the word appears with this quantity and this ictus in *Aul.* 411:

attát perii hercle egó miser: aperítur bacchanál; adest.

The different incidence of ictus in *íllī* and *illíc*, both of which were in the time of Plautus used either as the Adverb 'there' or as Dative of the Pronoun 'to him,' has been obscured by the scribes of the MSS. of Plautus, who have usually changed *illi* Adv. to the classical *illic*, and *illic* Dat. to the classical *illi*, e.g. *Capt.* 278:

quód genus *ílli* est únum pollens átque honoratíssumum,

where the MSS. offer *illic*, the classical form, but where the metre requires *illi*. That Plautus used *horúnc*, *harúnc* (with this incidence of ictus) but *hórum*, *hárum* before a word beginning with a consonant is certain (see Studemund, *Jahrb. Phil.* cxiii. p. 57), though this usage too is often obscured by the MSS. In *Pseud.* 69, for example, *harúnc uolŭptátum*, the Ambrosian Palimpsest alone has preserved the true reading *harunc*, while the Palatine MSS. have altered it to the more familiar *harum*. The normal ictus *quíd ístic* or *quid ístíc*, *quíd ístuc* or *quid ístúc*, agrees with what the Grammarians tell us of the strong stress on the Interrogative and of the oxytone nature of *istíc*, *istúc* (for *istúd-ce*).

Seyffert (in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, xviii. 1577) states that *potin*, *viden*, *abin*, etc., are never found to represent an iambus at the end of a line or hemistich in Plautus (cf. Intr. ii. § 3).

I fancy that the common incidence of ictus on the final syllable of a word (or phrase) uttered in a tone of strong surprise or indignation reflects

the accentuation of every-day life, e.g.

Capt. 837 Cédŏ manum. *Manúm?* Manum, ínquam, &c.
Most. 595 Non dát, non debet. Nón *debét?*, &c.
Trin. 940—1
Ad caput amnis, quód de caelo exóritur sub solió Iouis.
Súb solio *Iouis?* Ita díco, &c.

Similarly in shouting, e.g.

Men. 432 Ého, *Messenió!* accede huc!, &c.,

and in the exclamation (usually) *eí mihí* (for details see Richter in Studemund's *Studien* i. p. 470).

8. The other class of words which accented the final syllable consists of those which have contracted their two last syllables into one, e.g. *nostrás* from *nostrátis* (the Plautine form), *abít* from *abívit*. These contracted Perfects take normally the ictus on their final syllable in Plautus and Terence.

9. Of trisyllables, we have seen that tribrach-words (like tribrach word-endings) are never used with an ictus on their second syllable, e.g. *genéra*, while dactyl-words are occasionally allowed with this incidence of ictus by Plautus (not by Terence) in the first foot of an iambic line or hemistich, e.g. *pectóra*. Molossus-words are not infrequent with ictus on the first syllable when their final syllable is elided, e.g. Ter. *Andr.* init.:

poéta cúmprim(um) ánim(um) ad scríbend(um) áppulit,

this discrepancy of ictus and accent being regarded as less unpleasant than a double discrepancy like *scríbendúm*. Cf. Intr. iii. § 7 on the tolerance of 'com*mut(em)*' &c. (as opposed to 'com*mutem*' unelided) in the 'even' feet of Iambic and the 'odd' feet of Trochaic lines (Introd. iii. § 7).

Bentley's (and Hermann's) theory that in reading Latin poetry the accent was shifted a syllable nearer the beginning of a word, whose last syllable was elided, would produce in this line of Terence an exact correspondence of accent and ictus; for *cumprímum* would become by the elision of the final *cúmprim(um)*, and *scribéndum* would be pronounced *scríbend(um)* from the same cause. But the theory lacks confirmation and seems on the face of it to be very unlikely to meet with any. (On Klotz's equally unsuccessful attempt to explain in this way scansions like *prófěct(o)*, see Intr. ii. § 29.)

The reason for Plautus' toleration of the ictus *pectóra* but not of *genéra* may have been that a word like *genera* could easily occupy some other part of the line, whereas, since an anapaest of the form ⏑⏑, –, e.g. *pec|tora sur|gunt*, is not legitimate in iambic verse, dactyl-words would find greater difficulty in gaining admission. The ictus is readily tolerated on the final syllable of a tribrach (and dactylic) word. The question however of the incidence of ictus (and accent) on final syllables rather belongs to the subject of enclitics and to Sentence-accentuation.

10. Of quadrisyllables, words of the form ⏑⏑⏑⏓, e.g. *balineae*, which, as we have seen, retained in Plautus' time their early accentuation of the first syllable, have the ictus also on this first syllable as a rule in the verses

of Plautus and even of Terence, unless where the presence of an enclitic causes a shifting of the accent. (Similarly with word-endings of this form, e.g. *puéritia*, a noun which takes the ictus on the second syllable in its single occurrence in Terence, *Haut.* 183:

Abdúxi ad cenam: nám mihi magna cum eó iam inde a puéritia.)

Words of the type –⏓–⏓, e.g. *tempestate*, *advenite*, are by the nature of Iambic and Trochaic verse restricted to the ictus *témpestáte*, *ádvenite*, which corresponds with their accentuation *tèmpestáte*, *àdvenite*; and much the same is true of words of the type ⏑⏑–⏓, e.g. *sepelire*, *sceleratos* (see § 1 *n.*). Choriambic words, e.g. *consilium*, *dimidius*, have usually the ictus *consílium*, *dimídius*, which corresponds to their accentuation under the Paenultima Law, though the ictus *cónsilium*, *dímidius*, &c. (like the older accentuation of the first syllable, § 1) is not at all infrequent.

Other combinations of four syllables of the type ⏑⏑⏑⏓ are freely used with ictus on the second of the group, e.g. *Is étiam* (*Epid.* 524), *An ábiit* (*Merc.* 981), where ictus and accent would not be in conflict. Similarly in combinations of three syllables of the type ⏑⏑⏓ other than in trisyllabic words or in the endings of polysyllabic words the ictus is readily allowed on the second of the group, e.g. *Sed úbi* (*Rud.* 465). This shews that it is considerations of the natural accentuation of these Fourth Paeon and Tribrach words which determine their metrical treatment by the Latin Dramatists.

11. To pass to the Accentuation of the Sentence. The Iambic and Trochaic metres, which Plautus and Terence employ in their dialogue-scenes, are the metres which come nearest to the language of conversation. Since the diction of these poets is patently the diction of the ordinary life of the time, and their dialogue-scenes reproduce all the varied phases of everyday speech, with its tones of banter and innuendo, of entreaty and refusal, of threatening, command and deprecation, they afford us an excellent opportunity of testing how far the sentence-accentuation was regarded in early Latin poetry. Lines like

Stich. 185 uéni illo ad cenam: síc face.
promítte uero; né grauare: est cómmodum.
uolo, ínquam, fieri: nón amittam quín eas.

Stich. 93 nón sedeo isti; uós sedete: ego sédero in subséllio.

Stich. 632 *A.* Égone? *B.* Tune. *A.* Míhine? *B.* Tibine, &c.

Merc. 947
út ualuisti? quíd, parentes meí ualent? tam grátiast:
béne uocas, benígne dicis. crás apud te, núnc domi,

have clearly the 'ipsissima verba' of actual Roman conversation, and would be uttered by the actor with the same gesture and tone that would accompany them in everyday life. Did then this intonation impress itself on the metre too? Do the emphasized syllables receive the ictus or metrical beats of the line, and are the subordinate words and unaccented syllables

relegated to the theses? Ritschl pointed out long ago in his *Prolegomena* (ch. xvi.) how consistently this was done in lines like *Trin.* init.:

A. Sequere hác *me*, gnata, *ut* munus fungaris tuom.
B. Sequor; *sed* finem fore quem dicam nescio,

or *Trin.* 20 sq.:

rogat
ut líceat possidére *hanc* nomen fábulam.

Here the unimportant words of the sentence (I have indicated them by italics), the words which might almost be omitted without injury to the sense, slip naturally into the theses of the lines. And since Ritschl's time investigation of the incidence of metrical ictus in Plautus and Terence has revealed the significant fact that this, that and the other colloquial phrase, phrases which evidently come direct from the streets of Rome into the Comedians' verse, observe as consistently a uniform incidence of ictus as a uniform order of words; and that, too, though there is often no necessity for this from the prosodical nature of the syllables comprised. The common phrase 'I wish to know,' *volo scire*, would from its prosodical nature, its arrangement of short and long syllables, require a metrical accentuation of this kind, *voló scire*; and we should expect to find Iambic lines beginning *voló scire ígitur* or *voló scire aútem*, &c. But the metrical accentuation in all the dialogue passages where the phrase occurs in Plautus is *volŏ scíre* (except in two where it is *vólo scire*, Kellerhoff in Studemund's *Studien* ii. 83), an accentuation which agrees with the normal subordination of the Auxiliary Verb *volo* (§ 2). Similarly the phrase of endearment, *voluptas mea*, is always scanned by Plautus *volŭptás mea*, with a shortening of the second syllable which is found when the next syllable has the natural accent, e.g. *volŭptátis*, *volŭptátem*, *potĕstátem* (Intr. ii. § 20); and this scansion corresponds to that shifting of the accent of *volúptas* which we should expect to be produced by the enclitic appendage *mea* (§ 2). A common expression of disappointment or despair is *vaé miseró mihi*, with this order of words and with metrical ictus on the Interjection and the last syllable of *misero*, not the first. Here too the enclitic appendage *mihi* would shift the accent from the first syllable of *misero* (the syllable on which the word would be accented if it stood alone) to the last. Those who cling to the theory that the Dramatists paid no regard in the construction of their verse to the natural accentuation of words, have strangely cited these phrases as examples of an incidence of ictus that conflicts with the elementary law of Latin Accentuation, the 'Paenultima Law'; for this would require as the ordinary accent *vólo scíre*, *volúptas méa*, *vaé mísero míhi*. This elementary law of word-accentuation, the accentuation of independent words, is the only law to which these theorists appeal. The fact that certain words, in certain collocations in a sentence, would have a different accent from that which they would bear if pronounced separately, has hardly ever been considered in their discussion of the relation of ictus

[redacted]

and accent in Plautus' lines. And yet it surely stands to reason that Latin, like other languages, would have its enclitic words, its auxiliary verbs, its emphatic and unemphatic pronouns, its subordinate words in certain word-groups, and that in a spoken sentence each and every word would not have meted out to it the full measure of accent which would be assigned to it when pronounced apart. In the phrase *volo scire* the verb *volo* is a mere auxiliary, which resigns its accent in favour of the important word of the phrase, *scire*. In *voluptas mea* the Possessive Pronoun is an enclitic appendage of the Noun, and the compound word *voluptas-mea* is by the ordinary law of Latin Accentuation accented on the antepenultimate, *voluptás-mea*. The Personal Pronoun is treated in the same way as the Possessive in *vaé miserŏ-mihi*.

Other examples of colloquial phrases in which a particular incidence of ictus is invariably or normally found are *nil moror* 'I don't care,' *eug(ae) eúgae!* 'bravo!,' *miserúm me*, or *me miserum* 'alas!' (Kellerhoff in Studemund's *Studien*, ii. 76), *heú me miserum* (Richter *ibid.* i. 565), *mánĕ manĕ*, 'wait a bit' (instances collected by Leo *ad Cist.* 704), *hábĕ bon(um)ánimum*, 'cheer up!' (instances in Loch *Imperat.* p. 17), *át ita me* in oaths, *tibi ego díco* in requests for attention (instances in Kaempf *Pers. Pron.* p. 17), *quis hic est?* (also *quis hic ést?*), *quid hŏc est?*, *quid ĕst quod...?*, *quid istuc ést quod...?* (instances in Dittmar *lat. Modus-lehre*, pp. 11 sqq.). And now that attention has been called to this point, a great many more will inevitably be discovered as time goes on. It is now coming to be recognized as the duty of an editor of Plautus to confirm the insertion or retention of a current phrase in this or that line by an appeal, not merely to the arrangement of the words, but also to the incidence of ictus, in the other occurrences of the phrase throughout the plays. The emendation *num quae est causa* for *num quae causa est* of the MSS. in the line (*Aul.* 262):

A. Hodie quin faciamus num quae causa est? *B.* Immo edepol optuma,

can be confidently rejected because it departs from the invariable order of the words in all other occurrences of the phrase in Plautus. We may almost as confidently reject any emendation which would involve a metrical ictus like *voló scire*, *vae misero mihi*, &c., in a dialogue passage.

12. The existence of a secondary accent along with the main accent must be considered in a discussion of Sentence-Accentuation as well as of Word-Accentuation. Just as a long word like *tempestate* could not be pronounced without a perceptible minor accent on the first syllable as well as the main accent on the paenultima, so a long word-group like *jus-jurándum* must have had a secondary accent on *jus*. The Latin Grammarians, as we have seen, scarcely ever allude to this secondary accent, whether in single words or in word-groups. They tell us, for example, that *unde*, the Relative, was an enclitic or subordinate word in the Latin sentence, in contrast to the accented Interrogative *unde*. But they do not add, what the analogy of other languages would lead us to expect, that in collocations like *und(e)-advénimus*, *und(e)-advéni* a secondary accent fell on the Relative. They are as silent about this secondary accent that must surely have accrued in such collocations to subordinate words, as they are about the secondary accent in long words like *tèmpestáte* and in word-groups like

jūs-jurándum. They do not even definitely inform us that these enclitic or subordinate words gained an accent of their own when immediately followed by another enclitic, that, for example, *unde* Rel. and *quis* Indef. were uttered with a certain stress in phrases like *únd(e)-lubet* (*Epid.* 144. On the monosyllabic pronunciation of *unde* see Intr. ii. § 14), *nequís sit árbiter* (the ending of an Iambic Senarius, *Poen.* 178), where they precede the subordinate verbs *lubet* (cf. *quílubet, quólubet*) and *sit.* And while they tell us that Interrogatives were accented, they do not say whether the accent of the Interrogative (as is the likely supposition) or of the Noun was stronger in a question like *quis hic homost?*, which in Plautus always takes the ictus on the *quis* and not on the first syllable of the subordinate word *homo* (see below). It is seldom that they condescend to such minutiae as the difference of meaning conveyed by the accentuations *sí quando* and (the usual) *si quándo*, a difference pointed out by Donatus in his note on Terence *Eun.* 437:

> scin síquando illa méntionem Phaédriae
> facit:

'*siquando*' *et prima syllaba acui potest et media, tamen variat sententiam,* and, no doubt, corresponding to our 'íf ever,' as compared with 'if éver.' In the absence of complete information about the accentuation of the spoken Latin sentence, it would be futile to attempt to compile exact statistics of the number of lines in which this or that accented word or syllable has or has not the ictus, and so it is difficult to demonstrate by figures the wonderful extent to which agreement of ictus and sentence-accent prevails in Plautus and Terence. It can be recognized by anyone who will take the trouble of reading a play or two with his attention directed to this point.

13. In connexion with Enclitic Particles, the remark of Servius (ad *Aen.* vi. 779) that *vidĕn* was the current pronunciation has been already mentioned (§ 7) as evidence of a return of the accent of a word to its usual place when the enclitic appendage was reduced by elision, *vidén* (i.e. *vídes-n(e)*) like *vídes* (in everyday speech *vidĕs*). As *dum* is an enclitic appendage of the Imperative, e.g. *excúte-dum* Aul. 646, *éuocá-dum* Most. 679, *aspíce-dum* Most. 1105, so is *sis* (from *si vis*). The normal incidence of ictus in Plautus is *properá-sis*, &c., but *vídĕ-sis*, &c. (Seyffert in *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1891, p. 112.) Similarly the normal ictus *primúmdum* (for instances see Richardson, *de* '*dum*' *particula*, p. 13) seems to reflect the accentuation.

14. Spellings like *saluost, saluast* shew us that there need be no clash of ictus and accent in a phrase like *salui-sumus* Asin. 320.

Nor can we find fault with the incidence of ictus in a phrase like *paupér-sum* Aul. 88, *uictór-sum* Pseud. 1036, *placitaé-sunt* Hec. prol. 21.

15. The stressed and unstressed uses of the Latin Personal Pronoun have produced two series in the Romance languages, e.g. Italian 'me,' 'te' emphatic, 'mi,' 'ti' unemphatic. These unemphatic forms are joined to the verb, e.g. *prestate mi il libro*, 'lend me the book.' If something

[redacted]

analogous took place in Latin (and I see no reason for doubting it) an ictus like that of *seruá-me*, 'save me,' in *Curc.* 628:

Phaédrome, obsecró, seruá-me, &c.,

cannot be quoted as an example of the conflict of ictus and accent. The accent of the Imperative standing alone would be *sérva*, but the word-group *serva-me* would take the same accentuation as a single word like *servámus*, *servátis*, *serváte*. (On the line-beginning *patér uocát me* Amph. 991 see Intr. iii. § 8.) An example of the emphatic pronoun is *Men.* 1076:

tú erus es; tu séruom quaere; tú salueto; tú uale.

Tibi ego dico, 'd'ye hear?,' has normally the ictus *tíbi ego díco* (a list of examples will be found in Kaempf, *Pronom. Personal.* p. 17).

16. The corresponding double series of Possessive Pronouns in Romance, e.g. Ital. 'mio' and 'mo' (as in 'ma-donna')[1], point to an emphatic and an unemphatic variety of the Latin Possessive, which seem to be reflected in the versification of the Comedians. If we contrast, for example, *Capt.* 261:

út uos hic, itidem ílli apud uos *méus* seruatur fílius,

and its emphatic *meus*, with the subordinated Possessive in a line like *Bacch.* 251:

heu cór *meum* et cerebrum, Nícobule, fínditur,

we shall not be inclined to agree with those who find in the *patér* of Ter. *Ad.* 983 an instance of conflict between accent and ictus:

fáciet, o uir óptume, o *patér-mi* festiuíssume[2].

The malediction *uae capiti tuo* always shews this incidence of ictus in Plautus, *uaé capití-tuo* (for details see Niemoeller, *Ipse et Idem*, p. 37).

17. The emphatic Demonstrative is seen in phrases like *is ego sum*, *ego is sum*, which in Plautus always take the ictus on *is*, as contrasted with the ordinary unemphatic usage, e.g. *proptér-eos*, *praetér-eos*. It is seen too in a line like *Poen.* 394:

óculus *húius*, líppitudo méa, mēl *húius*, fél meum.

18. The common phrase *ei rei operam dabam* (*dabo*, &c.) takes in the lines of Plautus the ictus on the Pronoun and on the last syllable of *operam*, *eí r(ei) operám dabam* (Seyffert, *Stud. Plaut.* p. 25 *n.*). This conforms with the subordination of the noun *res* (§ 19) and of the verb *do*. Just as we throw the stress on the noun 'noise' and not on the verb 'make' in the

[1] Ital. *mo*, *ma*, Fr. *mon*, *ma*, Span. *mi*, *ma* point to a reduced Latin form *mus*, *ma*, *mum*. Whether this form may be posited for Plautus and Terence is doubtful. On Ennius' use of *sas* for *suas* etc., see *Lat. Language* vii. 12.

[2] *Mi pater* and (less usual) *pater-mi* Voc., *meus pater* and (less usual) *pater meus* Nom., seem to have been word-groups. Their accentuation would be *mi-pater*, *patér-mi*, *méŭs-pater* (§ 1, Intr. ii. § 3), *patér-meus*. And this is the normal incidence of ictus in these phrases in Plautus.

phrase 'to make a noise,' so the Latin verb in such phrases would seem to have been subordinate, and this subordination or enclisis would imply in Latin its fusion with the noun into a word-complex, *operám-dabam* (cf. *pessúm-do, venúm-do*). We cannot then find a conflict of accent and ictus in such phrases from Terence as:

Ad. 473 *fidém-dans*, iurans se íllam ducturúm domum,

Phorm. 492 Nondúm mihi credis? Háriolare. Sin *fidem-do!* Fabulae!

Andr. 243 itane óbstinate *operám-dat* ut me a Glycerio miserum ábstrahat?

19. Among Subordinate Nouns like our 'thing,' 'kind,' 'part' in such phrases as 'something of that kind,' 'some parts of England' we may reckon in Latin *res* (e.g. *quáre, quamóbrem*), *modus* (e.g. *quómodo, quemádmodum*), *locus* in the adverbial word-groups *ubi-loci?*, *interea-loci*, &c. Donatus in his note on Ter. *Eun.* 255 (II. ii. 24):

dum haec lóquimur, *intereá loci* ad macéllum ubi aduentámus,

tells us that *interea-loci* formed a word-group with accent on *a*, the last syllable of *interea* and the antepenultimate of the word-group. In Plautus we have already seen the subordination of *res* in the phrase *eí r(eí) operam dabam* invariably echoed by the incidence of ictus on the Pronoun. *Mala res*, the equivalent of *malum*, 'punishment,' 'evil in store,' seems to be a word-group with metrical ictus corresponding to the accentuation *mála-res, malaé-rei, malám-rem, malá-re*, e.g. *Trin.* 1045:

hércle istis *malám rem* magnam móribus dignúmst dari.

Similarly *bonus vir* shows normally the ictus *bónus-vir* (final *s* usually did not produce length by 'position' in the time of Plautus), *bóne-vir*, &c. The same subordination of *vir* is seen in the common phrase *scelŭs viri* 'the wretch,' which exhibits the normal ictus of a Fourth Paeon word, *scélu'-viri*. The phrase *nemo homo* (a curious indication of the early date of the reduction of *ne-hemo*) takes the ictus always on the first syllable, *ném(o)-homo* (Seyffert in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, 1894, p. 329).

20. Prepositions were fused with a following Noun into a compound word and would be entirely without stress in a group like *ad-caúsam*, as in a compound Verb like *accúso*; but before an enclitic or unemphatic Pronoun they would doubtless take an accent, *ád-me, ád-eum*, like Greek πρός με, Engl. 'to him,' 'for him,' Early Irish for-m 'on me,' for-t 'on thee.' This treatment of the Preposition before an unemphatic Pronoun is reflected in every page of Plautus and Terence, who hardly ever relegate it to the thesis unless the Pronoun is elided, e.g. *ad-m(e) ádvenis*; and it is likely enough that the elision of the Pronoun restored the Preposition in actual pronunciation to its unaccented state. A good example of the treatment of the group when the Pronoun has emphasis is seen in *Asin.* 772:

abs téd accipiat, tíbi propinet, tú bibas,

[redacted]

and of the ordinary group, *Trin.* 79:

suspícionem et cúlpam ut *áb se ségreget*,

where *ab se* is written in the best Palatine MS. *apse*, as it would probably be pronounced. A disyllabic Preposition was accented on the final syllable before an enclitic Pronoun, an accentuation very faithfully reflected by the incidence of ictus in Plautus' lines, e.g.

Trin. 619 úlciscare et míhi ut *ergá te* fúi et sum, referas grátiam.

ib. 733 sine dóte, quom eius rém *penés me* habeám domi.

Stich. 415 et is hódie *apúd me* cénat et fratér meus.

Before a Noun on the other hand *apud* is quite differently treated. In the phrase *apud forum*, for example, Plautus scans *apŭd forum*, and this word-group shews the same incidence of ictus as a four-syllabled word of this (Fourth Paeon) form (§ 1), *ápŭd-forum* (Intr. ii. 19).

21. The strong stress of Interrogative, and the weak stress of Relative and Indefinite Pronouns, is reflected in the versification of Plautus and Terence in their treatment of such a word as *unde*. If we examine the instances of *unde* Relative and *unde* Interrogative in their plays[1], we see that in the great majority the Relative stands *in thesi* and the Interrogative *in arsi*. Similarly *quis* Interrogative, a word which naturally stands at the beginning of a sentence or line, will be found in this position far oftener in Trochaic lines, where the ictus falls on the first syllable, than in Iambic, where the ictus falls on the second syllable of the line. The predominant stress of the Interrogative in the phrase *quis hic homost?*, 'who's this?' is echoed by its normal ictus *quís hic homost?* (Seyffert, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1891, p. 108). Similarly the normal incidence of ictus in *quíd ita?*, *quíd agis?*, *quíd dĭis* (Skutsch in *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1892, p. 1615) seems to reflect the pronunciation *quíd-ita?*, *quíd-agis?*, *quíd-dĭis?* A good example of the treatment of Interrogatives is *Asin.* 258:

Únde sumam? quém ínteruortam? quŏ́ hănc celocem cónferam?

It may be added that *quídum?* takes normally the ictus on the first syllable (instances in Richardson, *de 'dum' particula*, p. 14), and similarly *quíd ĕ́st quod...?*, *quíd ístuc ĕ́st quod...?*, *quíd hŏ́c est quŏ́d...* seem to be normal (examples in Dittmar, *Studien zur lateinischen Moduslehre*, pp. 11 sqq.). The hypothetical accentuation of the postposited Relative, as in *Troiae qui primus*, &c. is reflected by the common incidence of ictus in such cases in Plautus and Terence (unless the prefixed word is specially emphasized), e.g.

Haut. prol. 43 nam núnc *nouás qui* scríbunt nil parcúnt seni,

Hec. prol. 12 *nouás qui* exactas féci ut inueteráscerent.

[1] The list will be found in Skutsch, *Forschungen*, i. § 5.

An example of emphasis on the preceding word is *Pseud.* 812

bouĕs quí conuiuas fáciunt herbasque óggerunt

(in actual talk pronounced *bóvĕs-quì*); cf. *Pseud.* 860

manŭm sí protollet, páriter proferto manum

(actually pronounced *mánŭm-si*. The context shews that *manum* was the emphatic word of the sentence).

Qui followed by *homo* seems to make a word-group *quí-homo*.

22. That the usual position of subordinate Conjunctions like *sed*, *et*, *ut* is 'in thesi' is a fact that will be patent to anyone who turns over the pages of Plautus. In the first 500 lines of—let us say—the *Amphitruo* an instance of *ut*, 'that,' 'as,' with the ictus can hardly be found, except in phrases like *út-lubet* (v. 396), where it would have the main accent of the word-group (cf. *quólubet*, *quílubet*), and *út-vidétur* (v. 334), where it would have a secondary accent.

23. Of Word-groups the Grammarians mention some, e.g. *res-publica*, *ius-iurandum*, &c., and the Romance languages point to others, e.g. *foris-facere* (O. Ital. *forfare*, Fr. *forfaire*), *ad-illam-horam* (Ital. *allora*, Fr. *alors*). A word-group of Adjective and Noun was apparently *mala crux* in the phrase *i in malam crucem*, 'go and be hanged,' for the group may be qualified by an Adjective, *i in maxumam malam crucem*. The accentuation *malám-crucem* is reflected by the normal ictus (for details see Luchs in Studemund's *Studien* i. pp. 18 sqq.). Other groups of this type are probably *bona-fides*, *mala-fides*, *magnum-malum*. The last is a common ending of a line in Plautus, who in *Most.* 670 admits *bonan fide* to the same position, in spite of the law against a diiambic ending (Intr. iii § 8). To the word-groups of Numeral and Noun, like *trésviri*, *vigintíviri*, we may perhaps add expressions of time like *vigintí-dies*, *trigintá-dies* (cf. our 'fortnight,' 'twelvemonth'), or of value, like *vigintí-minae*, *trigintá-minae* (cf. our 'sixpence,' 'twopence'). The normal ictus in the Dramatists is *trígintá dies*, *vigintí minae*, &c., although *viginti*, *triginta*, when not used in such collocations, show the ictus which we should expect, *vigínti*, *trigínta* (Skutsch, *Forsch.* i. 162). On *operae-pretium* see Bryant in *Harvard Studies* xi.

24. But this theory of Plautus' regard for Accent, in addition to Quantity, must not be pushed to an extreme. There is just so much disregard of Accent as to produce what Ritschl happily calls the 'harmonische Disharmonie' of Plautine verse. Thus when two words are contrasted with each other, they have both as a rule the metrical ictus, as they would in everyday speech have a marked accentuation, e.g. *Dáuus sum non Oédipus*, Ter. *Andr.* 194, and the absence of this feature often indicates a corruption in the line. Still the rule is not slavishly followed. It is sometimes disregarded intentionally, e.g. *Trin.* 59:

uin cónmutemus? túam ego ducam et tú meam?,

where in speaking one would naturally accentuate the first syllable of all four words, *túam*, *égo*, *tú*, *méam*, but where the adaptation of the metrical ictus to each of these would have a monotonous effect. Sometimes it is departed from through metrical necessity, e.g. *Trin.* 65:

edepól proinde út diu uíuitur, bene uíuitur,

'the *longer* we live, the *better* we live,' where the prosodical nature of the words *diu* and *bene* made it difficult to bring them into the Arses of the line. Terence gets over this difficulty in *Eun.* prol. 8 by adopting the unusual scansion *bonĭs* (Intr. ii. § 17):

ex Graécis *bónĭs* Latínas fecit nón bonas.

(Cf. *Poen.* 853 *mórăm*, emphatic.) We must never forget that the metre of Plautus is quantitative metre, not accentual metre like ours, and that all that can be posited for his verse is a regard for accent as far as this is consistent with quantitative requirements. We cannot in all cases look for an invariable adherence to an incidence of ictus which will conform with the accent, but only to a normal adherence. Metrical exigencies and a variety of other causes must again and again have intervened to make close adherence impossible, even if desirable, just as metrical exigencies have often necessitated departure from the regular order of words in a phrase or sentence. Even in our own accentual verse the word or syllable which receives the stress of the voice in pronunciation does not always receive the beat of the verse, which often falls on a quite unstressed and subordinate word. Much more is this conflict of accent with ictus to be expected in the lines of the Latin Drama, which are quantitative lines and not accentual.

25. We have hitherto considered the regard for accent shewn in the dialogue metres (Iambic and Trochaic) of the Dramatists. In the choric metres, Bacchiac, Cretic, Anapaestic, &c., we should be prepared to find a different state of things, for the passages composed in these metres were not spoken but sung, and do not, like the dialogue passages, aim at a close reproduction of the tone and diction of ordinary conversation. The Cretic and Bacchiac metres, with their abundance of long syllables, especially favour forms like *mihī*, *modō* (*hóc uolŏ scíre tĕ* Curc. 134), which were not the forms employed in common speech; and in Cantica in these and other metres we often find departures from the normal order of words in current phrases and from the normal incidence of ictus as well. Yet on the whole we find the accentuation of the Paenultima Law and the Sentence-Accentuation very fairly conserved in these Cantica; and we have already noticed how the admission of a long syllable in the place of the short thesis is regulated by regard to the accent of the word (Intr. iii. §§ 28, 36).

The Cantica of Plautus however that are composed in the Anapaestic Metre seem often to trample rough-shod on the accentuation. Their harshness in this respect has been already referred to the Greek rule of Diaeresis at each metrum, or even each single foot, and the attempts

of later Dramatists to free themselves from these Greek trammels have been mentioned (Intr. iii. § 20). It is a significant fact that Terence, who makes occasional trial of Bacchiacs, Cretics and some other lyric metres, never attempts a Latin imitation of Greek Anapaests.

26. The Romans themselves often seem to speak of the lines of Plautus and Terence as if ictus and accent were very much the same thing. This appears not only from the comments (already referred to) of Donatus on the pronunciation of words in some lines of Terence, e.g. *sí quando*, *intereá loci*, but from the express statement of Aulus Gellius (second century A.D.), who mentions an appeal to a line of Plautus, ending *áliorum áffatim est*, for the accentuation *áffatim*, and to a line of Terence, ending *ex-ádversúm loco*, for the accentuation *exádversum* (the usual accentuation of his own time being *affátim*, *exadvérsum*), and quotes the testimony of a pupil of Valerius Probus that that celebrated Grammarian (of Nero's time) read the line of Plautus with that pronunciation of the word.

INDEX.

[redacted]

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. AND C. F. CLAY, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.



